

LIBRARY



ONTARIO

DEPARTMENT OF MINES



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

1897

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

— • —

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

— • —

Volume XXXVII

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28th, 1951

— • —

March 28th, 1951

A-2

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

MR. R. ROBSON (Hastings East): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the second Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and move its adoption.

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: Mr. Robson, from the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, begs leave to present the following as its second report.

Your Committee begs to report the following Bill as amended.

Bill number 114, "An Act to amend the Oleo-margarine Act".

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(signed) R. Robson,

"Chairman."

1000

The first of these is the

second

the third of these is the

the fourth of these is the

the fifth of these is the

the sixth of these is the

the seventh of these is the

the eighth of these is the

the ninth of these is the

the tenth of these is the

the eleventh of these is the

the twelfth of these is the

the thirteenth of these is the

the fourteenth of these is the

the fifteenth of these is the

the sixteenth of these is the

the seventeenth of these is the

the eighteenth of these is the

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

RURAL TELEPHONE SYSTEMS

Hon. G.H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio):

Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting The Rural Telephone Systems", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) please explain.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will try to explain to the House this Bill, and the policy which is behind it.

In the Throne Speech it was indicated that rural telephones in Ontario, speaking very generally, have not had the opportunity of keeping in touch with the wide technical developments in the communications fields. Within the province there are three telephone systems operated either by the government or its agencies, -- The Northern Ontario system operated by the Ontario Northland Railway, the private systems operated by the Department of Lands and Forests, and the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario. In addition to this, through the operations of the Telephone Act and the Municipal Board, we have a section under Mr. J.A. McDonald which for years has supervised with the Municipal Board a great variety of company matters.

We therefore have in government services, or agencies,

A-4

a number of top-flight officials who have a great knowledge of the problems with which this Bill deals.

Some three years ago an inquiry was instituted by the Department of Municipal Affairs and a preliminary survey was made of the situation which is complicated indeed. We have in the province telephone companies, some municipally owned, some privately owned, some co-operatives, varying from 10 subscribers in size to 5,000 subscribers in size. The Board has record of 518 telephone companies operating in Ontario with 175,307 telephones and 33,025 miles of pole line carrying 255,493 miles of wire and representing an investment of \$19 million. It is interesting to note that Ontario has almost half of all the telephones in Canada counting the Bell Telephone Company and has 26.5 'phones for every 100 of population. In other words, more than one 'phone for every 4 of our people. Our concern with this Bill, of course, is with 175,000 telephones in the rural districts.

These 518 companies vary from efficient, well-operated units to those which are very poorly run and give a positive minimum of service. In a large number of these companies the standards of service are far below the progress which has been made in other lines. The standard of rural life has changed very greatly in the last few years. We now have 300,000 rural customers enjoying the benefits of electrical power. This represents about a million of our rural population. School facilities are such that equality of opportunity for rural people in education is fast becoming a fact. Rural roads are now being snowploughed, so that our rural people can live on their farms with the same conveniences as people

in urban areas. One place that we are behind is in rural telephone communications.

May I say to the hon members of the House that in a county like Haliburton, within the last few years there was not such a thing as a secondary school. Now, in that county due to the betterment and snowploughing of roads, they have formed a central system, where there will be one secondary school, which will provide for these people an equality of opportunity, which they never had before.

The government's investigation of this problem has indicated the desirability of working out this problem in partnership with the companies I have mentioned. There is no desire on the part of the government to employ strong-arm methods and, in fact, it is not desired in any way to give that impression. Rather, the government would prefer to sit in with these 518 rural companies, large and small, and get their advice, suggestions and full-cooperation in any moves that are made.

It is desirable that there should be a period of investigation, after which it can be decided what course to take. It is quite probable that a Telephone Commission, somewhat after the lines of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, should be formed after the fullest of investigation and all are satisfied that this is the right course. In the meantime, in view of the fact that the Hydro-Electric Power Commission has some 35,000 miles of rural power lines which can be used for communication purposes, and also the fact that the Commission is operating a sizable telephone operation of its own, that the Commission should be the co-ordinating agency. The government therefore is placing in

A-6

the hands of the Commission the sum of \$100,000 which will be placed in an account known as "The Ontario Telephone Account". The Ontario Government will pay the entire bill. There will be no charges to be paid by the users of Hydro. The Commission is being used at the present time as the readiest method of effecting the co-ordination required to tackle this problem.

The section to be formed in the Commission, and which would be completely paid for by public funds, will be such as to include not only the Commission's experience and facilities but those of the Department of Lands and Forests, the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, the Municipal Board and any other department or branch of Government. These will be formed into a unit to collaborate and inquire into ways and means to best promote better telephone facilities in Ontario, to disseminate information and advice which may be helpful to the 518 operating companies, and to co-operate with and assist them by means of making available engineers, technicians and workmen, and also purchase for them materials and equipment at once.

Mr. Speaker, The Hydro Electric Power Commission, with its 35,000 miles of line, offer a very interesting field of investigation. It may be that science will devise ways and means by which those lines can be used not only for the transmission of electrical energy, but for the transmission of sound waves, such as we have in telephones. In other words, one wire may not only transmit the electrical energy, but on a different frequency, it may transmit a number of different waves which would serve other individuals or communities.

That is a very interesting experiment, and we hope not only to make available the 35,000 miles of hydro-electric lines -- rural lines -- but to co-ordinate into the company's systems in the province on some reasonable basis, the transmission of sound waves over the wires which are there, and which are necessary in the telephone business.

Among the first things to be done by the Committee to be formed by the Commission will be to invite the Telephone Companies to sit in with them and to determine the best and most practical means of proceeding.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we want to be helpful, we want co-operation; we want the telephone companies, many of which -- I should say from one-third to one-half are co-operative -- to feel that they have a partner sitting beside them, who will be helpful, who will not shove them around or expropriate their lines, or do things which they might feel were against the interests of those companies, many of which have operated for a great many years.

At this time it has not been felt advisable to give the Commission powers to own or to operate or acquire companies or to effect amalgamations. It has been felt better that the Commission's work should be exploratory and advisory at the present time, and that if we are to embark upon more extended operations, as I have outlined, then a separate Commission should be formed with explicit powers but this only after the fullest of consultations with the existing telephone companies. In other words, the underlying principle of this measure is first of all to obtain the fullest of

A-8

co-operation and understanding so that whatever is done will be after full consultation and the most thorough investigation and study of all concerned.

Again, the principle of this Bill is that it is in the public interest that the telephone systems serving the people of rural Ontario should be improved, extended and coordinated and underlying this Bill is the intention to make our rural telephone services in Ontario the very best that can be devised, and to this end we are asking the co-operation of all people.

Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of this Bill, and a general outline of the intentions of the Bill.

I may refer the hon. members of the House to the Report of the Telephone section of the Municipal Board, which operates under Mr. J.A. McDonald. In that you will find a wealth of information concerning the nature and extent of this problem, together with additional information secured from investigations which have been made over the last two or three years into this very complicated problem.

One of the alarming features of this situation, Mr. Speaker, is that we have some 518 large and small telephone companies in Ontario. A number of those telephone companies are at present in difficulties. In many cases, they are absorbed by a larger company, perhaps by The Bell Telephone Company, and in those cases the cream of the business is taken, and the skimmed milk is left, and many people are left without service.

That is a highly unsatisfactory state of affairs, at the present time, and it is quite understandable that to enter into this picture, with 518 companies, and possibly

The first of the two main parts of the work is the history of the movement for the abolition of slavery in the United States. It begins with the early efforts of the Quakers and the Puritans, and continues through the work of the Abolitionists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The second part of the work is a history of the movement for the abolition of slavery in the British Empire. It begins with the early efforts of the Quakers and the Puritans, and continues through the work of the Abolitionists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The third part of the work is a history of the movement for the abolition of slavery in the United States. It begins with the early efforts of the Quakers and the Puritans, and continues through the work of the Abolitionists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The fourth part of the work is a history of the movement for the abolition of slavery in the British Empire. It begins with the early efforts of the Quakers and the Puritans, and continues through the work of the Abolitionists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The fifth part of the work is a history of the movement for the abolition of slavery in the United States. It begins with the early efforts of the Quakers and the Puritans, and continues through the work of the Abolitionists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The sixth part of the work is a history of the movement for the abolition of slavery in the British Empire. It begins with the early efforts of the Quakers and the Puritans, and continues through the work of the Abolitionists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

518 different points of view, depending on the localities, to use any compulsion in the matter of the amalgamation of these companies, or anything of that sort, including the expropriation of lines or equipment or assets, might create a feeling of disquiet on the part of a company, which perhaps would think it was a move to radically interfere with their business, and not be helpful, but out to "gobble up" their business.

That is not the intention at all. This Act is being devised and designed as a co-operative approach, and the intention of the government is to be helpful and useful in the big problem, and in the solution of it. we are asking their full co-operation and advice.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) whether the "Ontario Telephone Account" will be known as the "O.T.A."?

MR. FROST: Well, due to the fact that the "O.T.A." has so far gone into the distant past, it might be possible to use that without any misunderstanding. In the days of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), the "O.T.A." was a name which was not particularly used in this province, unless one wanted to get into trouble.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have a number of routine Bills which arose out of the Budget, and which usually are a prelude to the end of the Session.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett,

A-10

that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend The Land Transfer Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is complementary to the Bill introduced a few days ago by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), relative to the higher standard of minimum fees for Registrars of Deeds.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a Bill to abolish succession duties, but to clarify certain points. Perhaps the most important feature is to clarify the section relating to gifts, and make the interpretations under that section parallel with the Federal Act. You will recall that some years ago the Act provided that gifts made back as far as 30 years were taxable. That was in the days of a different brand of government in this province --

MR. HARRY BIXON (Brant): And as I remember on Mr. McAuley's suggestion.

MR. FROST: It was not in the day of "modern Liberal Democracy" anyway. Some years ago we changed it to five years, and it remains at that figure, except for certain rules which will bring it in line with the Federal Act.

THE PROVINCIAL LOANS ACT

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker,

Letter to the Editor

Dear Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst.

and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,

J. H. [Signature]

[Address]

[City]

[State]

[Country]

[Post Office]

[Post Office]

[Post Office]

[Post Office]

I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has some amendments to modernize the Provincial Loans Act. Among them are amendments to bring our Act in line with the requirements of the Security Exchange Commission in the United States. As the hon. members may know, we have on provincial account about one-quarter of a billion dollars of loans, in the New York market. It is necessary, of course, to refund these loans from time to time, and the provisions in the Act in connection with sinking fund and other requirements are not as specific as they should be, and our Solicitors have advised us there should be some amendments to the Act which are to a certain extent of a routine nature, to clarify certain provisions and sections in the Act, and also to repeal certain sections which have become inoperative by the passage of time.

THE HOSPITALS TAX ACT

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act ", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: This Bill was indicated in the Budget. It provides that entertainment in lounges and dining lounges, which is taxable, shall include everything but what you might term "background music". I do not know whether the hon.

A-12

members are familiar with the meaning of "background music". It means anything beyond the music by an orchestra, or piano or instrument, and shall be taxable.

In addition to that, it reduces the tax from 15% to 12%, and sets out a new schedule of taxes which will apply on that rate.

RAISING MONEY ON THE CREDIT
OF CONSOLIDATED REVENUE
FUND

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Hon. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, I may say there are these few minor changes in this Bill. One of them has to do with the suspension arms for signal light controls at street intersections. Another is an electrical mechanical signaling device to be used in lieu of hand signals in automobiles. I think, after next year, all manufacturers manufacturing cars will have those devices on their cars, in line with the change of manufacture of motor vehicles.

A-13

Another is one which requires solicitors and clients' fees to be taxed in cases of unsatisfied judgments, and it defines the terms.

Hon. G; A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present to the House the following:

- (1) Report of the Minister of Public Works
of Ontario for the 12 months ended
31st of March, 1950.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. S.J. HUNT (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring this matter to the attention of the House. This may be a question of mistaken identity, but I see on my desk a notice that the Select Committee on Government Commissions will meet tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. However, it is addressed to "Mr. Dennison". The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) might be deeply disappointed, if he did not receive this notice.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Before we leave this matter of introduction of Bills, Mr. Speaker; on yesterday's Order Paper there was still standing a notice of motion in the name of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), "An Act to amend the deserted wives and children's maintenance Act". It has disappeared from today's Order Paper. I think the original notice was given on February 26th.

It seems to me we might have from the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) an explanation, that is to say, whether he has abandoned his intention of introducing this particular Bill.

MR. PORTER: No, I do not know why it disappeared.

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): There was another

A-14

Act, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PORTER: I think the other Act was to be put in the Statute Law Amendment Act. It was a very minor amendment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are not abandoning it?

MR. PORTER: Oh no.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Third readings.
Order No.1.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 122, " An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, I move third reading of Bill No. 122.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE LOCAL IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 123, " An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, I move third reading of Bill No. 123.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Dunbar, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 124.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend the Vital Statistics Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. J.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of

A-16

Bill No. 126, " An Act to amend The Assessment Act",
Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs):
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 126,
"An Act to amend The Assessment Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass
and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading
of Bill No. 127, " An Act to amend The Municipal Act", Mr.
Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs):
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 127,
"An Act to amend The Municipal Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass
and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, third reading
of Bill No. 99, "An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act",
Mr. Welsh.

Hon. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker,
I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 99, "An Act to
amend The Liquor Licence Act".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

1875

1875

1875

1875

1875

1875

1875

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

FAIR REMUNERATION TO FEMALE EMPLOYEES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order, third reading of Bill No. 120, "An Act to ensure Fair Remuneration to Female Employees", Mr. Daley.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labor): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 120.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 9.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND ONTARIO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, third reading of Bill No. 132, "An Act to approve an Agreement between Canada and Ontario respecting the Development of the Niagara River", Mr. Challies.

Hon. G.H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move third reading of Bill No. 132.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

A-18

THE HOUSE IN COMMITTEE (Mr. PATRICK in the Chair)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.

22.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-second Order, House Committee on Bill No. 121, "An Act to promote Fair Employment Practices in Ontario", Mr. Frost.

Section 1 agreed to.

On Section 2:

MR. H. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 121 be amended by re-numbering section 2 as subsection 1 of section 2, and adding thereto the following subsection:

"This Act applies to the Crown in right of the Province of Ontario and any emanation thereof".

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, the reasons why this amendment would be unacceptable are the same as those given yesterday on a similar motion by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) concerning fair wages for female employees, or, should I say "equal pay for women".

As I explained yesterday, the Civil servants have their own methods of discussing their problems with the government, through their Joint Advisory Council in the various departments, and the general Council which sits with the Civil Service Commissioner.

The hon. member (Mr. Walters) may say that the scheme under this Act which belongs to all Ontario does not fit into an organization which does not come under the Labor Relations

A-19

Act. That is the case with the Civil Service. It is also the case with the Federal Civil Service. We have our own methods of dealing with that.

In connection with the Bill covering equal pay for women it has not been necessary to advise the Civil Service Commission to see that this Act is put into effect, because it is already in effect, in the service. There has never been any question raised concerning race, color or creed, and I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Walters) that the principles of this Bill will be the principles of the arrangements between the Civil Service and the government. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Walters) will see that you cannot make this Act applicable to the Civil Service, or to those branches of the Service which do not come under the Labor Relations Act. On the other hand, you need not worry but what the principles of this Act will be fully carried out.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, there are a number of government Commissions which are employers in the ordinary sense of the word, engaged in collective bargaining with their employees, and so on, and the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) was boasting the other day about the Hydro Commission collectively bargaining with its employees.

I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that these employers, as emanations of the Crown ought to be covered, even if there is a special condition applicable to the Civil Service, and which special condition should not continue much longer. Surely the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will realize that Commissions, like the Liquor Commission, the Ontario

Journal of Management Studies, 19(1), 67-80.

Northland Railroad, and the Hydro Commission -- to mention only three -- should be bound by the laws of the province of Ontario, the same as any other employer. I think if they are brought under the law, they will have respect for and obey the laws, which cannot be possible if the government is to hold them up as examples for other kinds of employers.

MR. FROST: The point is purely an academic one. There is no issue at stake. To import into the Act a new principle as regards the relations of the Crown and its employees, I do not think would be desirable. If that becomes an issue, then it will be met, with the full understanding of the whole problem, and no doubt it will be met in a different way than by doing something here which might be done in a left-handed way, and which I think has been decided by most governments, on a different basis.

I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Park) that aside from the academic issue, there is no issue at point at all, for the reason that these principles always have been in force in the relationship between the government and its employees.

I did not think it was necessary to write a letter to the Commission, but I will certainly do so, to make perfectly sure that there is not anything in our relationship which would run contrary to the principles of the Bill.

MR. SALSBERG: Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) also agree that such a letter reach all of the government-owned companies, Boards and Commissions?

MR. FROST: Oh yes.

MR. WALTERS: Mr. Chairman, I listened with attention

A-21

to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost), and when this Bill was introduced, I spoke on it, and I tried to convey to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) the results of the efforts which have been made in the United States with respect to this legislation. One of the things is, as I have stated before, the additional impact on the lives of the public is sometimes pretty heavy. I think the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) will admit there is a peculiar psychology to this Legislation, when a government makes no provision to come under its own legislation. I do not know how other people's mind work, but in my own opinion, I would think it rather peculiar that the government should pass this legislation, and yet have no provision in the Bill for itself coming under it, ~~it~~ only to serve as an example to other employers.

MR. SALSBERG: May I ask a question of the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) a propos of this? I agree with the principle of this amendment, but would it be correct to assume if there is no section in the Act excluding government employees, or employees of government-owned companies, it may be taken for granted that it will apply to all government services?

MR. FROST: No, I do not think so. The difficulty with the Act is this, and you can see where it runs counter to the Whiteley Council arrangement. This Act provides for a conciliator and director intervening. I think the principle of the Act should be in force now, but due to the fact that there is a director appointed by the government, I do not think it would be at all desirable, that the machinery contained in this Act should be enforced, because, as I say, the arrangement between the Civil Service and

the governments generally, in Canada -- certainly in Ontario and in the Federal government -- are conducted in a different way.

In our own Civil Service, as I have explained before, I think perhaps we have the most advanced Whiteley system-- if I may use that term -- in Canada. I do not want to make comparisons, because it is hardly fair, but I am satisfied our arrangement with our 12,000 or 13,000 employees is much in advance of that which is used even by the Federal Government in its relationships. The Council meets frequently -- I perhaps should not say "continuously"-- but it can almost be said that for every reasonably practical purpose, they are in constant consultation. It is quite obvious, if someone is discriminated against in the service, because of race, color or creed, the matter would go to the Council and be dealt with in that way. I am sure that situation does not arise. I do not say this for publication, but the Commission in the past has gone out of its way to give opportunities to people who might come under the classification of "race, color or creed". Perhaps some of the hon. members have seen examples of that, which I think clearly indicates that long before the Act was ever introduced, such a thing did not exist in our Service, and we have no intention of ever allowing it to exist.

The amendment negatived.

Section 2 agreed to.

On Section 3:

Hon. WILLIAM GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): In connection with Section 3, I cannot let

the opportunity pass without saying a few words. Windsor has received a great deal of unnecessary criticism in the past, much of which was untrue. But let me say to the hon. members of this House that discrimination cannot be charged to Windsor. May I be permitted to mention the names of certain people who are highly respected in our community, amongst is Dr. H.T. Taylor, a member of our Board of Education, and also its Chairman on a number of occasions; Doctor Roy Perry, an Alderman who was elected with the highest majority ever attained in his ward, and our own "Jimmy" Watson, the City Solicitor of the City of Windsor. All these gentlemen are negroes, and they have been chosen for their ability and integrity, and as far as this Bill is concerned, let me say that "actions speak louder than words".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: The hon. Minister (Mr. Friesinger) might have gone farther and given credit to the Windsor City Council for being one of the first in Ontario to pass an anti-discriminatory law, which later spread to Oshawa, and even reached the City of Toronto.

Sections 3 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 6:

MR. SALSBERG: I have an amendment, which I hope the Government will agree to, I would rather not put it to a vote, if they will not agree, but I think they should.

The intended amendment is as follows:

"That Section 6 of Bill 121 be amended
by substituting the word 'shall' for

March 28th. 1951.

A-24

t he word 'may', after the word 'Minister' in line 1, and by substituting the words, 'any complaint by any persons' with the words, 'the complaint of any person that he' --

"so that the amended section shall then read;

"The Minister shall, on the recommendation of the Director, designate a Conciliation Officer to enquire into any complaint that any person has been refused employment, discharged, or discriminated against contrary to Section 4, or that any person has issued any circular, in any form, or published any advertisement, or made any enquiry, contrary to Section 5."

All this amendment would do is to reinstate into the Section the same wording which was contained in the first Bill which was before this House. The first Bill made it possible for complaints to be laid by any person while this Bill restricts this right to persons immediately affected I would suggest the government should agree to this editorial change, although "editorial" may not be the correct word.

Secondly, that they agree to place the word "shall", as it was contained in the first draft for the word "may" which is now in the draft. I am not pressing for a vote, but I do present it in the hope that the government will agree to this amendment. Of course, if they do not, there is no use voting on it.

I suggest it is important, and would allow an

A-25

organized group in any community, which is aware of a discriminatory practice, to bring it to the attention of the director, so he could start an investigation.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think in the initial period of administration of this Act, I would want that change made. It seems to me at the moment we have no idea of what volume of complaints will come in, and I think they should be from the person who claims to have been discriminated against.

If some group of organized labor came to me, or the director, and said "We know this is going on", I believe we would investigate it. But I would not want it so that some organization other than a labor organization, could just have heard that some person had discriminated against somebody, and would send us on all kinds of "wild goose" chases, only to find that the person who claimed to have been discriminated against had not been, and the story just was not so.

I think if a person really feels he has been discriminated against, for any of the reasons contained in this Act, he should be serious enough about it to sign a prescribed form, which we will furnish, to indicate to us that this is his complaint. I do not think it would be fair to the Department, with the wish to administer this Act fairly and properly, to allow complaints to come from hither and yon, without any foundation of fact behind them. I cannot accept that amendment.

Section 6 agreed to.

On Section 7:

MR. PARK: Mr. Chairman, on Section 7; I wonder if sub-section 3 of Section 7 where the question of reinstatement, as appearing in the fifth and sixth lines, could not be amended to include also "hiring and promotion"? I have an amendment

A-26

I could present, but I think if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is willing to bring it forward, I will drop the matter, so that it will take care of the situation affected by an employer not only on the question of reinstatement, but also the question of hiring and promotion.

MR. FROST: The hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) may follow me in this explanation. I have discussed this matter with some bodies which are interested in this, including the Association for Civil Liberties and some others, and we have discussed it with our own advisors. The hon. member (Mr. Park) suggest that the word "hiring" --

MR. PARK: Hiring and promotion.

MR. FROST: Some of the bodies with whom we have discussed it think that "promotion" should not be included, but they did suggest that "hiring", should be "employing".

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): What is the difference between "hiring" and "employing"?

MR. FROST: This Act provides, if there is a discrimination on the part of someone who is employed, the Director may make an investigation, and may make a recommendation, and that even covers the matter of wages. You can see it is very much easier. We are dealing with a new principle in this Bill, in looking for ways and means to make the principle workable in the province. From the standpoint of resinstatement of an employee who has been discriminated against, you might say the quantum meruit of the wages is established, and there is not the difficulty which would be there, if you used the expression "hiring". I feel it is far better to make it simple as it may be, and that it has reasonable appearance. It adds to the

10-12-1917

Dear Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the matter of the proposed extension of the term of the lease of the land owned by the Government of the District of Columbia, and in reply to inform you that the same has been referred to the proper authorities for their consideration.
I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours very truly,
J. M. Smith
Secretary of the District of Columbia

difficulty of administration.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that one of the great purposes of this legislation will be performed by the passage of the Bill itself. Frankly we are anxious to keep away from things which irritate the public.

That was the advice we received from the State of New York. As the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) said, he is going over to investigate the situation there after the conclusion of this Session of the Legislature, so we can see the workings ourselves. In fact, Governor Dewey advised me of this last summer, when I asked him about the Act. He said there was a lot of misgivings in the State of New York on the principle of the Bill. He said there was at the time a department store which did not employ colored persons, because they felt some injury might be done to their business. He said that most of these employers were very glad to have the opportunity of saying "It is the law of the State of New York that we must employ these people", with the result that the colored people came into employment of this large department store.

We think that will be the effect of this Bill. After all, our people are good people. I think our people have already accepted the principle of this Bill. I think that is where the greatest good will come. But to get the administration of this Act spread into other fields, would only create difficulties, and probably would do more harm than good at the present time.

I suggest we keep the Bill as simple as it is practical to do, and avoid complications which might create bad public relationships, and do more harm than good.

Mar. 28th. 1951.

A-28

I would prefer we cut "hiring" out of it at the present time.

MR. PARK: I appreciate the desire of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to have a Bill which can be administered effectively.

However, I would point out that the operative section of this Bill provides that it is an offence on any person acting on behalf of an employer to refuse to employ -- that is, refuse to hire. That may result in a complaint and the commission must say "There is nothing in the Act defining our power with regard to hiring," This Bill provides less than is required to carry out the operative portion of the Bill. I think that it is absolutely essential the Commission be given some power on the question of hiring.

I appreciate the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) point that it is difficult to arrive at a compensable figure for loss of earnings because of discriminatory practices in hiring. The discretionary power of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is pretty broad in this Bill, and I think the common sense of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and the common sense of the Director may overcome this problem. I am sure it is the view of the Director, and that of the government that, as far as possible, they want this Act carried on through conciliation proceedings, rather than through orders of Courts. That is the most desirable way of carrying it on. But I do think the Commission will be frustrated unless you give them the authority.

I would ask seriously that the government re-consider its position not to include "hiring" in sub-section 3 of Section 3 of the Bill.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, just a word on this

Section. I, too, had a proposal for an amendment on this very point, with one additional suggestion, that is, to eliminate two words, where it says "without compensation", to leave it "with compensation", to make it abundantly clear that when a person is reinstated, he is reinstated with compensation.

In regard to the word "hiring", which I call "operating"; I think the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) calls it "promotion ", I want to give an instance. There is a certain firm of which I know on Yonge Street, not far from here, where the owner defiantly refuses to employ certain people, flagrantly telling them "I will not hire you, and if I find out that you are of that group, no matter how long you have been here, you will be fired".

I venture to predict that there will be cases where the Director will have to step in, in precisely such a case, where a man declares he will not hire a certain person. But that is an unsatisfactory action. It is important in a case like that; the principle was established that the person be engaged. The principle is there, and we hope it will clarify the requirements to show there is a difference between "reinstatement" and "hiring", and the firm I mentioned should be obliged, if only as a demonstration, to hire the person whom they refused to hire for no other reason except that he is a member of a certain religious or other group. I think it would be far better if the word "hiring" is included.

MR. L.E. WISMER (Riverdale): I wonder if we could not get the government to change its mind just a little. In the Grade Union movement it has been often said that there was no need for legislation of this sort to protect

March 28th, 1951

A-30

the organized workers, but through his organization, and his collective agreement with the employers, the discriminatory act was taken care of in that way, and this sort of legislation was not necessary. It certainly is not necessary to protect the people in a closed shop agreement, because the Union would do it, especially in some of the Union shops with the preferential hiring Agreement.

But in the broad sense, the Trade Union movement wants something of this sort, in order to reach to a higher level. If an employer is free to hire whom soever he wishes, than anything which may be agreed upon between the Union and the employer can only affect the people who have been freely hired by the employer.

It seems quite specific, under Section 3, that the employer may not, after this Act becomes law, refuse to hire. But suppose he does. It would be in violation of the Act, and a complaint will come to the Director. It seems when the Director attempts to settle that affair, he may come all the way, to get to the employer, and more or less convince him that he should not have refused to employ this person, and yet, under Section 7, he just cannot get the employer to hire that person. That is my sole argument, and it seems to me it will reflect in the matter of hiring where we have perhaps a large number of such discriminatory actions, or the possibilities for them. I am just wondering if the government might not ease up a bit. The purpose of the wording could be adjusted in sub-section 3, so that the question of hiring will not be mixed up with the wording in regard to compensation. Perhaps there is no loss attributable to the employer in

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

VOLUME 11, NUMBER 1

JANUARY 1918

CHICAGO, ILL.

OFFICE OF THE PUBLISHER

535 N. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Subscription price, \$5.00 per annum in advance

Single copies, 15 cents

Entered as second-class matter, June 26, 1911

Postpaid

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917

Authorizes sale at wholesale price of 50 cents per copy

Postmaster: This publication is published weekly except on Sundays and holidays

Copyright, 1917, by American Medical Association

Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill.

Postpaid

Entered as second-class matter, June 26, 1911

Postpaid

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917

Authorizes sale at wholesale price of 50 cents per copy

Postmaster: This publication is published weekly except on Sundays and holidays

Copyright, 1917, by American Medical Association

Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill.

Postpaid

Entered as second-class matter, June 26, 1911

Postpaid

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917

Authorizes sale at wholesale price of 50 cents per copy

Postmaster: This publication is published weekly except on Sundays and holidays

Copyright, 1917, by American Medical Association

March 28th, 1951

A-31

some cases, but surely this Act is going to have a very restricted application, if it does not provide for an effective and complete solution for the settlement of cases where there have been refusals to hire, in violation of Section 2.

MR. DALEY: Of course, human beings being what they are, I do not believe, by any stretch of the imagination, this Act will create a Utopia, where everybody will follow straight along the line. As the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) stated, by the very passing of this Act, we will be encouraging a great many to do the right thing, in connection with the matters mentioned here, that is, race, creed, color, and so forth.

I presume if a person actually does not want to hire an individual, he can find some other way of refusing to hire him, other than for the reasons mentioned here.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

We are trying to try, by a process of education and appeal to fairness and the fact that the law is there to get people to do the right things.

Now, we gave a lot of time in designing this section, it was considered from all angles and I am not capable of just taking some suggestions quickly and putting it into a section, changing it over and have all the answers on what it does. I do not think we should do that. We developed this Bill carefully and with the assistance of the Law Clerks and the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) and I certainly would not care to just take a word and change it without having an opportunity to consider just what that word meant.

Now, in connection with the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) who spoke previously, concerning with or without compensation^{"for} loss of earnings"-- and other benefits, that is going to be a very difficult thing. What was the loss if the man had not even been hired?

MR. SALSBERG: In cases of reinstatement there is a loss of time.

MR. DALEY: Well, we have not had any disputes where a man have been fined for Union activity, at least alleged to have been, and ordered reinstated to his post. He might have left this job and gone into another one tomorrow and not lost anything or may have lost a portion of his time. All these cases have to be considered and I think we almost have to have that, "with or without compensation". The very fact he may be ordered reinstated if he has been fired I think in some cases is sufficient, in other cases there is monetary loss which might have been extremely large or small and that has to be decided by the Commission.

March 28th, 1951

B-2

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we should leave the Bill as it is until we have an opportunity to work it out.

Sections 7 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 11:

MR. PARK: Before Section 11 is taken, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has thought about following the practice he follows under the office, shop and factory Act, requiring the posting in plants and so on of the general outline of the Act? I have here the poster that is used in Massachusetts on the same subject and this particular poster is required under the law with every employer, employment agency and labor union. It is pretty well as you do now with the Office, Shop and Factory Act and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) might take that matter under consideration. I will send this poster over to him and he may have an opportunity to examine it.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have it because I feel something like that would be necessary.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, just a last remark on this Bill before we finish with it. I have an amendment but I am not putting it before you, Mr. Chairman, as a basis for a vote on an amendment. I am reading it in the hope that the government will agree to something like it. The proposed amendment is as follows:

"The Minister shall appoint a representative F.E.P. Commission whose members are to serve without remuneration and whose duties it shall be to plan and promote educational programs on a province-wide scale explaining the spirit and purpose of this Act with a view to eliminate the incidence

March 28th, 1951.

B-3

of discrimination in employment and that the Minister shall further appoint local and regional F.E.P. Commissions wherever necessary to work under the guidance of the Provincial F.E.P. Commission."

Now, Mr. Chairman, just one word. The purpose here is to accomplish, at least in a preliminary way, what practically all sections of the House agreed to as necessary, namely, the development of education among the people on this issue so that the law will have to be applied only rarely, if ever, in time. The main criticism leveled against the present Bill was that it failed to provide the educational machinery. As a Private member, of course, I cannot propose anything that calls for the expenditure of money but I feel that even a voluntary Committee appointed by the government, a representative Committee, would accomplish a great deal educationally in the province on behalf of the government in the development of the kind of attitude that I am sure we all desire in the field of employment.

Perhaps no amendment is necessary, perhaps the government thinks that they can appoint such a Committee without a specific clause in this Bill. However, I do submit it to the government for their consideration and I am sure that not only I but everyone would welcome some indication from the government that a Commission along these lines will be brought into being for the purposes already indicated.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) of course, raises a very interesting point and, I will say to him, a very important point.

The fact is, that it is on the body of opinion lying behind a law like this that the real force comes. There is no doubt about that, it is the public sentiment behind any law that makes the law effective and that is one of the difficulties we have in law administration particularly in such things as in, for instance, the liquor question because of the honest differences of views which are so wide and so varied in the province that you have such difficulty of enforcement. Now, the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) very ably and very properly pointed out that in the State of New York they have such a provision as he mentioned. There is there under the Commission provision for local, regional and state wide facilities for education. Now, when this matter was discussed here, I think a year ago or two years ago, we laid emphasis on the matter of education. I think that we felt then and we feel now that the education of our people along these lines is very important. Now, from a practical standpoint, Mr. Chairman, the problem arises that our own system of government, with the Department of Labor, there is no provision in the Department of Labor for education on the scale that is envisaged here. Actually speaking, it is really a matter more properly for the Department of Education and we felt that to add this to this Act and make it a function of this Commission or the Director and those under him was adding a complicated factor which was dividing our efforts. We discussed the matter with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) and at the present time there is taught in our schools -- I was very glad to hear, I have a niece over here at the University and in talking with her I was very happy to find

March 28th, 1951

B-5

out that there is a widespread feeling among our young people about discrimination. The fact is, that is one of the convincing things about this Bill, is the fact that our young people so widely take that view. I think the Department of Education, with the children that are coming along, the 600,000 or 700,000 school children coming along, and getting a year older each year, that all of this education will be accomplished within four or five years. Now, the problem arises that some of the others, people who have grey hairs like myself, I do not whether we are passed education or not. I do not think so, and I think perhaps that is a matter that can be dealt with. The fact that this law is passed is an indication to people of our day and generation that that is what the people think and what the people want. I want to compliment the hon. member for bringing this matter up, for stating his case, I think, in a very reasonable and proper way and I can assure him we are not unmindful of that. The fact is, the point he raised is perhaps the most important point in the whole thing. We are not unmindful of that and we are not leaving that undone. It is not necessary to include it in this Act, in fact, it would really be undesirable from a standpoint of administration to include it but from a standpoint of government practice and policy I can assure you it is included in all of our schools, in the attitude of our school teachers and I think in the syllabus in connection with physics and things of that sort and it is being taken care of really in a very satisfactory way.

Section 11 agreed to.

B-6

Bill No. 121 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No 23.

THE ESCHEATS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-third Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 135, "An Act to amend The Escheats Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 135 reported.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Order No. 24.

THE LAW SOCIETY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 136, "An Act to amend The Law Society Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 136 reported.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Order No. 25.

THE MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fifth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 137, "An Act to amend The Mining Act", Mr. Gemmell.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 137 reported.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Order No. 26.

THE COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-sixth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 138, "An Act to amend The Community Centres Act", Mr. Kennedy.

1891

1892

January 1st 1902

Dear Sir,

I have the honor to

acknowledge the receipt of your

letter of the 27th inst. regarding the

matter of the 1st inst. and in reply to inform you

that the same has been

forwarded to the proper authorities

for their consideration and action.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,

Yours very truly,

J. H. [Signature]

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Enclosed for you are

two copies of the report of the

committee on the subject of the

proposed changes in the constitution of the

association.

I am, Sir, very respectfully,

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

I am, Sir, very respectfully,

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

I am, Sir, very respectfully,

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

On Section 1.

MR. J. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, on Section 1, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) to a criticism I have of the definition of a community centre under the present Bill. Up in Renfrew county, a small group of people at Meade Station undertook to build a rink last year and they asked me if they would be entitled to help under this Act and I told them I did not see any reason why they should not. They got the land on a 20-year lease and they took up subscriptions and it turned out that because they had the land on a 20-year lease, because the farmer would not sell the land to them they were excluded from getting a grant for the building of this rink, whereas other communities nearby got up to \$5,000. This particular rink only cost a matter of \$1,000 altogether. The farmers cut the logs, they did everything by voluntary work and I am wondering if this interpretation, which I believe gives a benefit, could not be extended to include others where they have a 20-year lease or more, if they could not get a grant.

Hon. T.L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, we have never done that. I remember having a row in my own community about 30 years ago where they did ask and I think they wanted to keep the deed in their own name but that institution is now dissolved. The deed was in the hands of the township Council. I think that is the only lasting body, a township Council or School Board.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 138 reported.

on 10/10/10

Dear Sir,
I have the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst. in relation to the above matter.
I am sorry to hear that you are having trouble with your machine.
I will be glad to help you in any way I can.
I have a few suggestions that might help you.
First, make sure that the machine is properly adjusted.
Second, use the correct type of material.
Third, keep the machine clean and free of dust.
Fourth, use the correct speed for the material.
Fifth, make sure that the machine is properly lubricated.
I hope these suggestions will help you.
If you need any more help, please let me know.
Yours faithfully,
J. H. Smith

Very truly yours,
J. H. Smith
Manager, J. H. Smith & Co.
100 Main Street, New York, N. Y.

B-8

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Order No. 27.

REGISTRATION OF NURSES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-seventh Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 139, "An Act respecting The Registration of Nurses", Mr. Phillips.

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 7.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips), is it the intention to bring this into effect in the near future?

Hon. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Chairman, this year, we hope not later than January 1, 1952. As soon as the nurses show they are ready to take it over, we are ready to declare it.

Sections 7 and 8 agreed to.

Bill No. 139 reported.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Order No 28.

NURSING

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-eighth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 140, "An Act respecting Nursing", Mr. Phillips.

Sections 1 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 140 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report certain Bills.

Motion agreed to.

March 28th, 1951

B-9

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee begs leave to report certain Bills without amendment and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

C-1

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 20, private bills.

CITY OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twentieth Order; second reading, Bill No.27, an Act Respecting the City of Toronto. Mr. Blackwell.

MR. C. E. REA (St. Patrick): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Blackwell, I beg to move second reading of Bill No.27, An Act Respecting the City of Toronto.

MR. FROST: This Bill was before the House and there was some debate on one of the sections relating to pension. I think the feeling was that the city of Toronto might discuss that section of the bill with the private members. Could anybody give us any advice on that? Personally, no one has approached me on it.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrews): I am sorry to advise the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the city council did not call the members together for discussion. I appeared before the Board of Control and urged them to convene the Toronto members for the purpose of discussing the Bill which is before the House which imitates the legislation they asked for this year, and I was given assurance that this would be considered and something would be done. I am sorry to say that to my knowledge nothing was done. I do not think any other hon. member for Toronto ridings can give any better advice.

C-2

MR. REA: With respect to the first part of the Bill I know the city of Toronto is very anxious to get it through. I feel that perhaps if we delete that part about which the discussion obtains and carry on with the bill from there, the city of Toronto would be satisfied.

MR. FROST: Fair enough.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Which section is that?

MR. DENNISON: Section 3. I think if we should delete section 3 -- I am directing my remarks to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and perhaps Section 4 --

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Section 3 in Committee?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. DUNBER: I think that is quite right.

MR. FROST: Let it go to Committee and it can be dealt with.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.30.

REGULATION OF LEASEHOLDS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirtieth Order, Second Reading; Bill No. 133, An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Leaseholds. Mr. Forter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of Bill No. 133, An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Leaseholds.

I do not know that I have very much to add to what I have stated on the first reading of this Bill. I think the hon. members of the House are fully aware of the nature of this problem, that there is still a situation in this province which requires control of leasehold premises. I did suggest in my statement on first reading that it was the intention of the Government to appoint two committees, one a select committee of this House to sit in between this Session and the next for the purpose of considering, reviewing and making recommendations in connection with the regulations which will be adopted by the passing of this Act and at the same time there will be another Committee of a different nature consisting of a judge and two other persons representing the landlord interest and the tenant interest. I believe the question has been raised since the first reading as to whether these committees will sit concurrently. I do not know that it will be necessary to decide at this date exactly when or how these committees may

sit but what we visualize as to the function of these two committees is simply that the hon. members of this House who will sit on the select committee are constantly in touch with the changing situation as it occurs throughout the province in one way and another made keenly aware of some of the iniquities which may develop under a system of this kind and who are, no doubt aware of many iniquities which have developed under the present regulations and that they would be in a very good position to focus attention on these

C-4

problems and endeavour to work out ways and means of dealing with these problems from time to time. On the other hand, the other committee is of a somewhat different nature. One of its functions would be to consider recommendations brought forward by the select committee, not from a point of view which we might have as members of the Legislature, but from the point of view of the conflict of interest between the two groups chiefly concerned -- the landlords, the tenants, and the impartial view of one who has no particular interest, whatsoever, -- a committee which can consider, and assist in recommending any changes which might have to be made, a committee which will be useful and of assistance to the select committee. No doubt much information which might come forward before the select committee could be turned over to the other committee for consideration. That is the view we have as to the function of these two bodies. We are not bound by any definite preconceptions as to just exactly how each of these committees might sit or how they might integrate the work. That will become more apparent when the committees begin to sit and tackle this complex problem.

I have nothing further to add to what I have said before advancing this bill, except to say I think that the method of handling this problem, by the terms of this bill, is about the only practicable way it could be dealt with under present conditions. I therefore hope that the House will pass this bill on second reading.

C-5

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is probably the only way of handling the situation at the present time. I am very sorry, however, that a year ago before the control situation degenerated into its present hodgepodge ---

MR. PORTER: We are now dealing with the principle of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DENNISON: --- or patchwork pattern, that something was not done. I think that is deplorable. The problem, as I see it to-day, is how to bring some sort of order and justice out of chaos because our rent control situation in the larger cities of Ontario now is very, very unfair both as to landlords and tenants. I can give you cases of two apartment buildings sitting side by side, one under control and the tenants paying \$40.00 or \$50.00 a month; the other decontrolled and the tenants paying anywhere from \$80.00 to \$125.00 a month. I can give you situations where there are houses side by side in that category. That certainly is not justice either to the landlords concerned or to the tenants concerned. It is deplorable, I think, that the federal government should have taken that method of decontrol and left this Legislature with a problem on its hands of this sort. I am going to tell you, the person who undertakes to bring order and justice out of this situation as it exists to-day is going to have a great many problems.

MR. DUNBAR: If you are on that Committee I will watch you.

MR. DENNISON: I will be difficult.

C-6

MR. DUNBAR: You are on that committee now.

MR. PORTER: You certainly are on the Committee.

MR. DENNISON: My riding is particularly concerned about this. I believe that the big majority of people in my riding, and even among the home owners, want to see controls continued. On the last day of April we would have had chaos if such legislation as this were not passed. I am wondering, however, how we are going to solve, and certainly just taking over the federal law as is, is not going to solve controls, but will just perpetuate existing injustices. I am wondering how we are going to solve a problem such as this.

MR. PORTER: It is all very well for the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) to speak on the principle of this bill. I do not know why we should go into all sorts of particular examples of what might be considered and dealt with by the Committee and by Orders in Council, to deal with this problem, when we have an opportunity of getting all the facts and information which will be before these bodies. Surely it is not advancing matters of concern to this House to deal with the sort of problems which will properly be dealt with once this bill is passed, and we take unto ourselves the power to deal with these matters.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is quite relevant.

MR. FROST: But superfluous.

MR. PORTER: I am not objecting.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I must point out that it now becomes necessary ---

MR. PORTER: I have withdrawn my objection.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Lest anyone should harbour the illusion that it has any merit, this bill now necessarily represent a great deal of delegated legislation. It is going to delegate very great powers to the government. That type of bill certainly invites the kind of discussion the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is carrying on.

MR. PORTER: I withdraw any suggestion with respect to principle.

MR. DENNISON: I want to point out the situation. A year and a half ago, the federal authorities told and tenants and landlords of this city that rent control was going to be abolished at the end of last April, 1950. On the basis of that statement certain tenants made other arrangements, they bought properties away beyond their means, others held on hoping the government would break its announced intention -- they probably had some experience with previous pronouncements of that kind -- they continued under control at the old rate. Those who took the federal government's pronouncement seriously, prior to April 30, 1950, were the ones who were caught and put under decontrol, because they moved out. The same thing has happened again. Again, we were told that the federal government would move out of the field on the 30th of April and this time apparently they are going to move out. We are moving in after the horse has been stolen, after this reckless decontrol has been only half accomplished. People to-day are pretty worried about this. I agree with the idea of setting up

C-8

a committee which will hear complaints from both sides, but I can see no solution other than to make some adjustment where, in the case of smaller accommodation some people pay \$50.00 or \$60.00 a month higher than others. I think some adjustment should be made to bring down those who have gone away above reason, sky high, and perhaps allow an adjustment with respect to those in the lower categories.

MR. DUNBAR: Is that not the idea of this bill?

MR. DENNISON: I hope so.

MR. ELLIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) that while the bill undoubtedly is all that which is being asked for at this particular time, the government is also inheriting a variety of problems in respect to eviction, in respect to rentals on leasehold property and so on down the line. There is no provision in the bill and I do not think the committee could bring in recommendations soon enough to prevent that. Surely somebody in the Department has made a study of it by now. I feel that in this bill at this time there should be some clause giving some direction to those who will be evicted as of April 30 under the present federal legislation, because, after all, all you are doing is taking over the federal regulations. Where they fall short, you have nothing to offer. Is that not right?

MR. PORTER: We can change them by order-in-council at any time under this bill.

MR. ELLIS: In other words, you are in a position

C-9

,to meet, then, a condition of evictions which will follow on April 1st --

MR. PORTER: There will not be any evictions following April 1st, except those which may be allowed under the federal regulations. We are taking over the federal regulations as they are. Insofar as those regulations would prevent evictions at the end of April, we are preserving that status by this bill until any order-in-council is passed which might change that or amend it.

MR. ELLIS: I believe that many of those eviction warrants are out now for these decontrolled properties. The present federal regulations do not control that situation. That presents an immediate problem. I think something should be done, put in the bill to meet that problem. At the present time there is not.

There is a further phase which is important, namely, the rental and housekeeping rooms. There is no federal regulation in respect of that phase. That is one of the sources of greatest exploitations in our housing shortage in the industrial centres to-day. I point out to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that is something which needs to be dealt with immediately because of the serious attempt of landlords to exploit those who are faced with eviction at the present time and who have to move into these so-called housekeeping rooms and working houses in general.

However, I would like to point out that, irrespective of all we can do at the present time in

trying to control the situation with respect to the rental bill, the fact remains there is only one permanent solution and that is low-rental, subsidized housing. I think when the Hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) goes into the matter and when the committee has an opportunity to look into this matter, they will realize, too, that the province of Ontario, must, of necessity, bring about low rental subsidized housing as an answer to the needs of those who are to-day the victims of the housing shortage.

While the bill is a move in the right direction, it certainly does not answer completely the problems with which we are faced.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): The remarks just addressed to this House by the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) evoked a comment from some hon. member on this side of the House that the Bill is re some- things hoped for and the essence of things not seen. A great many people have gathered the impression that this bill involves a new deal in rent control. We are just going to taper off as best we can from the point at which we are taking over. As has been indicated, that is a point which is rather difficult, that is widely out of balance, and it is charged with that thing which is nearer class warfare than any other department of civil life, and that is antagonism between landlord and tenant. That antagonism will permeate the discussions in committee in this House and in the administration of this bill. It is one of the most wretched things

C-11

which has come into Canadian life. We have to bring in this bill, and in housing as the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) has just said, a real attempt to minimize it. It is worse than anything that you see sporadically in labour relations, because, after all, when a strike comes to an end that eventually dies down. When you are dealing with landlord and tenant it is that close daily contact which generates the most obnoxious kind of friction. It gives rise to a problem which is going to be immensely difficult with which to deal in administering this bill. What I hope the House realized, and if I am wrong I hope the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will correct me, is that there is no intention, as I understand it, to use even the wide regulatory powers which are here vested in the administration to re-write a new set of rent control regulations; you are just going to do a patching job on the regulations we are now taking over from Ottawa. That you should be armed with those powers at this time is a desirable thing. I think the government is entitled to the credit of being fore-handed in this matter. Yesterday and to-day I have been a little irked, but I have kept my silence at various points and which the powers which must necessarily rest in a Minister, in the Lieutenant-Governor, have been called into question. I do not see any escape from that. If the abuse comes, then let the criticism come.

MR. PARK: Before the bill is given second reading, I think this should be said, that the government is

C-12

about one year late in taking action on this question. Had the government acted a year ago, when the federal government made its statement, in December, 1949, some of the complications that the committee will have to wrestle with, would not have occurred. That is the first point which needs to be made. The indecision of the government on this question has created more trouble than we would otherwise have to contend with. I regret that the government, in taking the steps it has taken on this occasion has decided merely to take over the disorderly decontrol which is going on under the federal regulations, That is the only way you can describe the present rent control regulations in face of the....

.....situations described by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison). There are, I am sure, others who can give instances where you have one single apartment building with six or seven identical apartments in it, with five or six of the tenants of those apartments on one scale of rent and the seventh tenant whose apartment has been decontrolled, paying some exorbitant rent. All kinds of situations have been allowed to develop under the federal decontrol measures. All we are doing is taking over

the unsatisfactory regulations for the time being. We are not "stepping into the problem" at all.

It is true that we are giving wide powers to the government to pass by order-in-council regulations which may emanate from the committee of the House. In the meanwhile the situation continues to deteriorate.

C-13

I feel that the government is subject to criticism that it did not act one year ago on this question, That ^{failure}, as I say, contributed to the situation which we now face. I regret particularly that the government has not indicated its viewpoints on the question of commercial rents; because that subject is becoming increasingly important. The fact that commercial rents are uncontrolled leaves a great many of our retailers, particularly, in the position where part of their costs have been uncontrolled. There is all kinds of racketeering going on in commercial rents at the present time. I think it would have been well worth while if the government had stated at this stage that commercial rents were to be frozen at this point until such time as we can work out, through the committee, the proposals that the government will eventually write into its regulations. I know of situations where merchants, who have been established for years, are facing the wall because of the use by landlords of the lack of control on commercial rents. Leases are being re-written in the middle of the term under pressure that the merchant will be evicted if he does not agree to tremendous increases in rents. I can think of one place. The other day, a druggist living in a store in the constituency I represent in this House, was told that his rent would go up immediately \$65.00 a month, though his lease does not run out until next December. If he did not agree to the immediate increase of \$65.00 a month, he would face eviction next December, and

they would give him his notice because that premises was not controlled. The result is that he is going to meet that increase in rent of \$65.00 monthly and his customers will have to pay it..

. That is the kind of circumstance which is going on and which will not be corrected by this

piece of legislation or by the policy the government has enunciated. I think we would have been far better off, and the committee would have been in a position to take action to improve the

situation, if the government said that, "AS now we are freezing all rents in Ontario -- commercial and

otherwise -- those which have been previously decontrolled or otherwise That the Committee from now on will work out a formula for improvement in the situation." Certainly there has to be mediation.

Certainly there have to be adjustments made. Anyone who makes even a most elementary examination of the situation would agree that is so. We need

to have the present situation at least tied down and tied down tight, because each and every day it gets worse. Then the committee can do an effective job. I am only sorry that the government failed to act a year ago.

As a matter of fact, it is worth noting that one year ago the level of the rent indexes for the city of Saskatoon and the city of Toronto were about even. As a result of the action of the province of Saskatchewan in stepping into this field one year ago instead of waiting until this year, is that the

C-15

rent index in Saskatoon jumped only one point in the past year, while the rent index in the city of Toronto jumped 15 points. Those are the only two cities in each of those provinces for which the federal government keeps a rent index. The failure of this government to act a year ago has already cost the people of Ontario a great deal in suffering and has increased the irritations and the attitudes which the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) mentioned in his few remarks to this House a moment ago.

The bill, as far as it goes, of course, is a step in the right direction, because of which it must be supported. I wish the government had indicated that it was prepared with respect to its policy to go a great deal further.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.26, Public Bills and Orders.

THE FACTORY, SHOP AND OFFICEBUILDING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 26th Order; House in Committee on Bill No.92, an Act to Amend the Factory, Shop and Officebuilding Act. Mr. Gordon.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No.92, an Act to Amend the Factory, Shop and Officebuilding Act.

MR. FROST: I believe that the committee approved of the bill introduced by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon). If that is so, we would give

C-16

the bill second reading. I understand this bill was approved of by the Municipal Committee?

MR. GORDON: Yes; but it was amended; instead of "The council shall pass a by-law on being presented with a petition from the merchants," it now reads that "The council may pass a by-law"; in other words, while the bill is acceptable, remains the fact that really the teeth are being taken out of it. "The council may". The Act now deals with half day; it says "shall".

HON. C. DALEY (Hon. Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I must say I am a little bit confused about just what the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) means. If a petition containing 75% of the names of people in a certain type of activity requests the council to pass a by-law, they must pass a by-law, at the present time; but, it is for a half-day; the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) is now saying it has been amended so that what the retail merchants wanted was to change the half-day to a whole day, so that the council would have authority to pass a by-law closing those particular shops for a whole day rather than a half-day. Is that right?

MR. GORDON: No, the half-day still stands. They can petition for a half-day or they can petition for a whole day.

MR. DALEY: But to-day it says they shall pass a by-law if they receive the required number of signatures on petition.

MR. GORDON: For the half-day.

MR. DALEY: Now they can decide whether they want to pass a by-law at all, or not, for a half-day or a full day.

MR. GORDON: They may.

MR. FROST: Perhaps I had better hold this until the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) comes back.

Might I move the adjournment of the debate on this bill and we will hold it until the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) comes back?

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply. (Mr. Stewart in the Chair.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 75, the Department of Planning and Development. Vote 128.

On Vote 128.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Are we not going to hear from the Hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Greisinger)?

HON. W. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Chairman, on March 8, during the debate on the Budget I felt that I had given quite a clear explanation of the activities of the Department of Planning and Development. I mentioned eight different divisions and I am quite willing to answer any further questions which may be brought up under

C-18

the votes.

MR. MacLEOD: Perhaps the Hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Greisinger) could give to us a brief resume of what he said then. After all, that is a long time ago.

MR. GREISINGER: It would take up too much time.

MR. R. THORNBERRY(Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, I notice the amount of travelling expenses is set at \$2,000 last year, the total expenses for travelling were \$5,642., and next to that is maintenance. This year \$11,780; last year only \$3,600. There is considerable variance between those figures. Perhaps the Hon. Minister (Mr. Greisinger) could give us a word of explanation.

MR. GREISINGER: In connection with the question the member for Hamilton-Centre (Mr. Thornberry) I might say that I took a trip to the United Kingdom with one of the officials in connection with different matters pertaining to Ontario House. That is the reason the travelling expenses were so much higher at that time. I did not quite get the second question. The hon. member for Hamilton-Centre (Mr. Thornberry) says "maintenance". Last year it was \$11,400; this year it is \$11,780 -- just about the same.

MR. THORNBERRY: I was taking it as being for one department, along.

Votes 128 and 129 agreed to.

On Vote 130.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): On Vote 130,

with respect to a party of conservation authorities, I believe a matter of 75 people travelled to New York State to look over some conservation projects there. Is that taken care of by the \$7,000 allotted last year for expenses in that respect, or were there separate items?

MR. GREISINGER: Yes. I think that was taken out of the expenses of last year.

(Take D follows)

MR. EASTON: Mr. Chairman, under the same vote, I believe that conservation authorities now do get federal and provincial assistance in setting up remedial works. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) indicate whether conservation authorities can be set up by the municipalities along the lakeshores, and would these authorities be able to receive financial assistance from the federal and provincial governments to aid in combatting lakeshore erosion to valuable farm lands?

MR. GRIESINGER: Mr. Chairman, we have had several reports on shore erosion, we have endeavoured on several occasions to establish authorities in order that we could attempt to get federal assistance. However, I must point out that in order to get federal assistance there is no conservation Act by the federal authorities comparable to our own and each case must be handled individually or processed individually. If an authority is set up that authority then brings to the conservation board or to the department of Planning and Development a scheme that they would like to have approved; if that scheme is approved by several departments of government involved, then it is processed with a view of obtaining $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent assistance from the federal government.

MR. WIL. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, under vote 130, I notice an item of \$750. for books, magazines, and in vote 123 there is an item for books and magazines. What magazines and books does the department buy and what do they do with them? You can buy a lot of them for \$750.

MR. GRIESINGER: In both the community planning branch and also the conservation branch, we attempt to get all the information we possibly can that is going on not only in the United Kingdom but in the United States and other countries

March 28, 1951.

D-2

in order to keep ourselves more or less abreast of what they are trying to do just for our own information and for our records. We have a complete library over there that can be referred to on matters of community planning or conservation, as it may apply in the United Kingdom or the United States or any other countries that have passed a conservation or community planning Act.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Chairman, before leaving vote 130, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) could explain the present status of the Humber Valley Conservation programme. At one time there was a very elaborate plan to develop the banks of the Humber and turn it into a playground, I believe, to provide a driveway up the Humber and nothing has been done to my knowledge so far. I just wondered if the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) would explain what the plans are?

MR. GRIESINGER: The hon. member (Mr. Temple) is quite right, there has not been anything done in connection with the Humber for this reason, the policy of the government up to the present time has been to look after flood control measures. There is actually no flood control in this in so far as the Humber is concerned, it is more to reforesting, playgrounds, and recreational facilities, and up to this time we have not gone into that kind of conservation, if you want to call it that.

MR. TEMPLE: I think the playgrounds and recreation part of the programme is perhaps one of the very important parts and something that the government should go ahead with. In the green area surrounding Toronto we have an opportunity to provide sunshine and fresh air for the people of the city and I think we should do our utmost to provide that, and worthwhile projects of this kind. Is there any hope that the hon. Minister

March 28, 1951.

D-3

(Mr. Griesinger) would do something about it, perhaps this year or in the near future? Is there anything we can do to persuade him to go ahead with it?

MR. GRIESINGER: Mr. Chairman, I must say I am in entire agreement with the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple), I certainly believe in playgrounds and recreational facilities and it is hoped that some day we will be able to get into that phase of conservation. However, I must say that up to the present time the only scheme that has been submitted by the Humber Valley authority is reforestation and that has been granted. I cannot give you a report at the present time as to how far they proceeded on that.

MR. TEMPLE: In connection with the Humber Valley, at this time last year when we were discussing these estimates, the Humber was flooding and the town of Bolton was under about three feet of water. Has anything been done to correct that situation and to prevent its recurrence again?

MR. GRIESINGER: Mr. Chairman, to my knowledge, I do not recall it ever being brought to my attention that they had a flood situation on the Humber.

MR. TEMPLE: It was very bad.

MR. DENNISON: They had a very, very bad flood.

MR. GRIESINGER: They have not applied up to the present time for any flood control scheme. It is not the Etobicoke you are thinking of, is it?

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, on vote 130, again on the Humber, last year and the year before on this particular estimate I raised the question of the government policy as initiated by the former hon. Minister of Planning and Development, the first hon. Minister of Planning

March 28, 1951.

D-4

and Development (Mr. Porter) and at that time, soon after the election, in 1948 the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) promised the Humber Valley authority that the government would subscribe 75 per cent of the funds necessary to start the conservation programme at the head waters of the Humber and the statement was made at that time that the 75 per cent would be forthcoming whether or not the federal authorities could be induced to pay half, or $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of that cost. Now, the Humber Valley authority people went ahead, and they got options on certain lands, farm lands and marsh lands in the head waters of the Humber only to find that the 75 per cent promised was reneged upon.

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I was the hon. Minister of Planning and Development when that situation arose.

MR. MILLARD: You are not the hon. Minister of Planning and Development that made the promise definitely and publicly in my presence at the Old Mill in 1948.

MR. WELSH: The matter came up for discussion when I was in that department and there was no promise made at any time the Humber development, that we would pay that if the Federal government agreed to pay their share which they did not do during my tenure of office.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to say definitely to the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) that he is absolutely mistaken in that statement. The statement was made by the then hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) at the Old Mill after the election in 1948, that that would be done regardless of whether or not the federal government gave the $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It was published in the Globe and Mail and I was present at the

meeting where it was made to the Humber Valley authority and that authority is headed by a good supporter of the government. When they came to collect they could not collect and found out too late, they let their options go and the whole scheme of the Humber Valley authority fell into disuse because the government reneged on its promise. There is no provision this year for any monies of this kind in this estimate and I would like to know whether you are going to pay these Valley authorities, or whether you are not going to back them; because that is the beginning of the end of the programme if you do not support or start paying at the head waters and do not start the conservation programme. There is nothing you can do about park land at the bottom end of the Humber River until something is done about the head waters. I would like to know, if the government meant what it said or did they not mean it. Do they mean something else? Are they going to support these Valley authorities, or are they not going to support them?

MR. GRIESINER: Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for the former hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter).

MR. MILLARD: You all represent the same government, surely you have not a different policy every time you have a new hon. Minister?

MR. GRIESINGER: I have no idea of whether he did or did not make the promise and as far as I understand, he did not make a promise to that effect. ; He explained it was based on the fact that $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent would come from the federal authorities. Now, the policy of the present Department of Planning and Development in so far as the Humber is concerned, is we are quite willing to put our $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in but I am in no position to say what the federal authorities will give.

March 28, 1951.

D-6

At the time that was put before them they did not see fit to make a grant of $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent but the present authority is $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in so far as this government is concerned.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Would you say then at that time the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) made an improper promise?

MR. GRIESINGER: I cannot speak for him.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I simply cannot allow the government to make a definite commitment publicly and then say they are not responsible for any such promise, and I would like to know if the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger), if he is prepared, if I bring the absolute evidence that the promise was made, to carry it out?

MR. FROST: I might say to the hon. member (Mr. Millard) that we are very definitely interested in these valley programmes. The fact is, we have made what has not been done

with the federal government. for a dozen years; we have entered into, I think, three separate partnerships this last year. Now, I think the report on conservation took this position, and I think quite properly, that to have a properly integrated plan in connection with conservation, you must have all three levels of government. I think that is one of the statements or recommendations in the Conservation Report. Now, I think it would be a great mistake for the provincial government to start entering into these projects without another partner in it. We have discussed this matter at great length with/hon. Mr. Winters at Ottawa and I understand under the Conservation Act of Canada that they are, unless the Korean War situation has interfered with their decision, I think they are prepared this coming year to enter into quite

an extensive partnership with us. Now, that was evidenced last year by the arrangement which we made in connection with the Kent marshes. I think we made a very decent deal with the federal government there. The big Fanshaw arrangement, will involve \$4 million or \$5 million which is a big project and the Luther propositions, all of that has taken place since this House last met. I think the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) would agree with this, that it would be a great mistake to depart from the partnership we have so patiently endeavoured to form over a period of years and which is now functioning. After all, our participation ought to be 37½ per cent, federal participation the same amount, and the municipal 25 per cent, that is the way to get things done and I think it would be a mistake to enter into these projects on our own.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, the previous hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Porter) is now in the House, I wonder if he would take his seat in the House, and deny that he ever made a definite promise in regard to this matter on behalf of this government regarding the 75 per cent to be paid by the provincial government, whether or not the federal government entered into this scheme in the Humber Valley at the Old Mill in August, 1948.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Let us go to the country, boys.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: Will you give me the answer to the question? I am asking the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) when he was previously the hon. Minister of Planning and Development did he not at the Old Mill in August, 1948 make the very definite promise on behalf of the government of that day that in

D-8

regard to the development of the Humber Valley under the Humber Valley authorities, that the provincial government, whether or not the federal government paid the 37½ per cent, would pay 75 per cent of the cost of approved projects of that authority? Was that statement not made by the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter)?

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I do not recall making any such statement in 1949 or any other time. I recall the meeting up there and several questions that were asked.

MR. MacLEOD: What were you doing at the Old Mill?

MR. PORTER: I recall a lot of questions, but I cannot remember everything.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Chairman, in regard to this vote, the conservation branch, listening to the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) remarks about their activities suggests that one of their great plans or projects was the Luther marsh and dam.

MR. FROST; It is not a very large one.

MR. McEWING: So, the thing I was going to point out was that the Department of Planning and Development has had very little part in that.

MR. FROST: Very little?

MR. McEWING: There can be very little credit going for taking that up, it has been waiting for four or five years.

MR. FROST: Are we not in for 37½ per cent?

MR. McEWING: Oh yes, but the Department of Planning and Development is not paying that particularly.

MR. FROST: Who is paying?

MR. McEWING: As far as getting it ready, it has been sitting there for years and years.

March 28, 1951.

D-9

MR. FROST: That is one thing, this government gets things done.

MR. McEWING: That agreement was there before this branch but nothing --

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): It was under a Commission.

MR. McEWING: Yes, that is right.

MR. FROST: Objection noted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) tell the House how many river or watershed surveys have been completed and the reports published by the Department?

MR. GRIESINGER: Would you like to have the names or just the number?

MR. OLIVER: No, the number.

MR. GRIESINGER: 13.

MR. SALSBERG: That is a lucky number.

MR. GRIESINGER: We are working on several this year, we will get away from that number.

MR. OLIVER: Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) trace to the House the developments that take place after a report on one of these watersheds is completed? What do you do next as a Department, or do you just let the report sit there? What is the procedure?

MR. GRIESINGER: No, Mr. Chairman, after the report is presented by the Authorities then it is entirely up to the Authority to bring into us the scheme that they may desire to have started first. The report itself may contain 20 or 30 different ideas to cover the whole watershed, of course,

March 28, 1951.

D-10

they cannot all be carried out at one time. Whatever the authority thinks is most important, they bring the scheme to us and after we get it it may be approved by several departments that are involved, then we have it processed through to the federal authorities to see if we can interest them in the 37½ per cent.

MR. OLIVER: Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) of the opinion that we should expect the federal government to participate in all these schemes? My understanding, at least my thinking along these lines has been that we should properly expect the federal government to participate as a unit in the development of large-scale undertakings like the Fanshaw dam and the Luther marsh dam and those big dams, but when it comes to what one may say the flood work and developing these plans within the province, surely there is a line of demarcation somewhere beyond which we are not going to ask the Dominion government to participate. Surely there is a place where we take the responsibility of the province in initiating and furthering these schemes.

MR. GRIESINGER: Mr. Chairman, I might say in the broadest sense of conservation, we have had a number of discussions with the hon. Mr. Winters who is just as much interested in conservation as we are ourselves, and they have a Bill known as Bill No. 62 which may help them to assist on the authorities end of this, the reforesting end of this, and the conservation schemes. I appreciate that they have no comparable Bill to ours, but we have interested them, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has said, on certain flood control measures and I believe there is a possibility that

something can be worked out for conservation and reforestation.

MR. OLIVER: What about recreation and things like that, you do not expect them to contribute to that?

MR. GRIESINGER: No, I would not think so.

MR. McEWING: Mr. Chairman, following the remark made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that this government gets things done, now, like all his suggestions that come within the ^{scope} of conservation, a lot of them are not big projects, but they are important in their field. Is it the expectation that you will not proceed with them unless Ottawa participates in them?

MR. FROST: Oh, no, no.

MR. McEWING: On the other hand, when he spoke about getting things done, what about the Conestoga dam, ^{which} it has been waiting for some time? Are they getting it done?

MR. GRIESINGER: I might say as far as the Conestoga dam is concerned, it is now in the hands of Ottawa and we have not received a reply yet whether they are interested in contributing their 37½ per cent.

MR. McEWING: I quite appreciate that.

MR. GRIESINGER: I might say in answer to your other questions, that there is nothing to prevent an Authority from going ahead on its own with recreational or park facilities if they care to do it. When we build up a report for them, it does not necessarily follow the complete report, and what we have suggested therein, that it is expected that the government would stop it. They are at liberty to ahead as an Authority to create parks of their own if they care to.

MR. McEWING: Well then, one further point on that, the Fanshaw dam would not go ahead unless Ottawa was participating, it was not a case of this government getting it done

March 28, 1951.

D-12

it was dependent somewhat on Ottawa the same as Conestoga which is not going ahead because Ottawa is not prepared so it does not entirely rest on a matter of this government getting things done. Now, the other point --

MR. GRIESINGER: It must be appreciated at the present time, I must be perfectly frank in saying that Ottawa at the present time is involved in a defence programme and I doubt very much whether we can expect assistance for the Valley authorities. For the time being, I do not think they could possibly do it under the circumstances they are working under, but we have had any number of conferences with the hon. Mr. Winters and I am happy to say to this House that he has been most co-operative and he is quite willing to do everything he possibly can because he conservation-minded himself and I am quite sure if we can get by the defence programme we will get 100 per cent co-operation from his department.

MR. McEWING: Well, further than that, where do we draw the line that the province can proceed on its own? Now, here is a series of small dams and a lot of other small projects, are we going to wait for Ottawa or is other work going to hold them up and we might just as well put them in a pigeon hole.

MR. FROST: Which dams are you talking about?

MR. McEWING: The wee dams in this conservation report, a series of small dams to stop erosion.

MR. PORTER: Can you not build them yourself?

MR. McEWING: Running off the water in different areas, there are a good number of things --

MR. DUNBAR: Let the beavers fell the trees.

MR. McEWING: That is the answer, is it?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, I have been trying ^{to get your eye} for the last 15 minutes but the assistant clerk hides me and the chairman cannot see me. Last year, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister's (Mr. Griesinger) estimates were before the House, I proposed to him that his department might very well undertake the -- keep those people quiet will you? The hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) is trying to listen to me and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is creating a disturbance.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. KENNEDY: I am sorry, go on.

MR. MacLEOD; I will start all over again. When the hon. Minister's (Mr. Griesinger) estimates were before the House last year I suggested that his Department might very assume responsibility for conducting an intensive survey of housing needs of the province of Ontario.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): Now, seven or eight years ago this government, under another Premier, gave certain undertakings which respect to housing, which were based upon information available to the government at that time, We were promised that an Ontario Housing Commission was going to be set up, charged with the responsibility of developing a great housing program in this province.

Actually very little has been done in seven years. It is true that a lot of homes have been built in Ontario since 1943, but relatively few of them have been built as the result of any serious intervention on the part of this government, I venture to say that a careful survey of the situation throughout the province of Ontario would reveal that tens of thousands of people in this province of ours are living in so-called homes which are not fit for human habitation. I can think of many towns and cities of Ontario where people are living in degradation and misery. However, I do think it is rather important that we should have some very precise information on this question, and I, therefore, suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) that his department might undertake, in the year 1951, the task which was undertaken by the Curtis Commission some 10 years ago, which gave us a fairly clear picture as to what the housing needs of Canada were during that period.

I have suggested a number of times in the last few years that this province needs a housing program which would call for the erection of about 25,000 low-rental homes per year for the next five years. I think we need 125,000

March 28th, 1951.

E-2

low-rental, subsidized units in this province. But I think it would be much better if the Department itself were to look closely into this situation, and see whether even that figure is adequate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have been told many times by the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his predecessor, that while the Progressive Conservative Government, which has held office since 1944, is not honoring their pledge to set up an Ontario Housing Commission, they have gone one better than that, and have given in its place an Ontario Department of Planning and Development in lieu of the promised Housing Commission.

Since one of his main functions is to concern yourself with the housing problem in the province of Ontario, I suggest it was quite proper for the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) to accept the proposal I made a year ago, and now one year later, I would like to enquire as to the results of that promised survey. Perhaps the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) could bring us up to date on that. He promised to do that. He has had a year to do it. What has he to tell the House?

MR. GRIESINGER: I recall distinctly the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) making that request, and shortly after that we did have a survey made through ourselves and the Central Mortgage Housing Corporation. I cannot give you the exact situation or the figures, as to what the situation was at that time, but I am positive our figures are quite fairly well up to date, because we are in touch with the Central Mortgage Housing Corporation practically every

E-3

day in the week. Possibly we could give some information to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) later.

MR. MACLEOD: Could you answer this question? Could you give me some idea of how many housing units have been built in Ontario since you introduced your amendment in the House a year ago? How many units have been built under this so-called low-cost housing Bill.

MR. GRIESINGER: By the government itself?

MR. MACLEOD: Yes. How many homes have been built under the provisions of the amendment passed a year ago?

MR. GRIESINGER: It is quite true we did not build any houses for our own account, but under the provisions of the Act, and with the Central Mortgage Housing Corporation, I would say, around about 25,000 or 30,000.

MR. MACLEOD: 30,000 new homes were built under the terms of the amendment?

AN hon. MEMBER: That is ridiculous.

MR. FROST: No, under the agreement as a whole. The figures are in the Budget.

MR. MACLEOD: I would like to refresh the hon. Minister's (Mr. Griesinger) memory. I have here the Press Report on the amendment introduced by him a year ago, and it says:

" Griesinger introduces low-cost housing Bill. First effective step toward a low-cost, government sponsored, housing program in Ontario, was taken in the Legislature yesterday."

MR. FROST: Whose words are those?

MR. MACLEOD: From The Globe and Mail, February 1950. Certainly the government did not object to having its legislation

E-4

reported in that way.--"This was the first step." --

MR. FROST: May I give the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) these figures?

MR. MACLEOD: Let me read this again.

"The first effective step toward a low-cost, government sponsored, housing program in Ontario, was taken in the Legislature today."

If the first effective steps were taken a year ago, what has the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) to report by way of accomplishment since then?

MR. FROST: This is from the Budget." The housing construction in Ontario reached an unprecedented level in 1950".

MR. MACLEOD: You have been there since 1944.

MR. FROST: Of an estimated 33,163 dwelling units completed during the year, 31,633 were new units, and approximately 1,500 by way of housing conversion, and a total of 27,512 dwelling units were still under construction at the end of the year. That was because of the material shortages, and the Federal government intervened with their restrictions in connection with mortgage advances, and I was interested to get some figures the other day to show that housing completions continued to mount in the province of Ontario. Last year, mark you, nearly 34,000 new housing units, in this province, which is a tremendous thing.

MR. MACLEOD: How many of those units would you say belong in the category of "low-cost homes?"

MR. FROST: That depends, of course, in many cases -- in fact, in all cases -- upon municipal agreements. As a

matter of fact, we have had virtually no request other than for the land assembly deals in the province of Ontario. The municipalities apparently feel -- and I think with justification -- that where new housing is erected, it lessens the pressure on other types of housing, and the needs are pretty satisfactorily taken care of now by the progress which has been made in the last year. If we can maintain that type of progress in the years to come, we will make very substantial progress indeed.

If we are faced with material restrictions, and cannot build that number, we, in Canada, make it ourselves into difficulty. But I believe we are limited by the amount of material available, which is something, as far as we are concerned in the province of Ontario, which we cannot control. We are dependent upon Federal control.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was not available, when I wrote to the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) on this point, on December 20th, 1950, and posed to him a number of questions which are essentially the same as those still on the Order Paper, and have been since February 2nd, in my name, to which the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) has given no reply, although he did reply to my letter on January 18th, 1951. The questions I posed to the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) were as follows:

In regard to Chapter 28 of the Statutes of 1950, amending the Housing Development Act, 1948, I would appreciate it if you would provide me with the following information:

- (1) How many projects have been undertaken for the

March 28th, 1951

E-6

acquisition and development of land, and where are these projects located? What has been the total amount of money advanced for these projects by (a) the federal government, (b) the provincial government and (c) the municipalities ?

How many housing units have been started and how many have been completed on the land acquired and developed under these projects?

How many of these housing units have been (or are being) built by (a) government agencies, (b) private builders?

How many of them are for sale and how many for rent, and what has been the average selling price of the houses for sale and what is the average rental of those being rented?

(2) How many projects have been undertaken for the construction of houses for sale, and where are these projects located?

What has been the total amount of money advanced for these projects by (a) the federal government, (b) the provincial government, and (c) the municipalities?

How many housing units have been started on these projects, how many have been completed and what has been the average selling price of the completed units?

Has there been any subsidization of the units constructed in any of these projects, and if so, what has been the average subsidy per housing unit?

E-7

- (3) How many projects have been undertaken for the construction of houses for rent, and where are these projects located?

What has been the total amount of money advanced for these projects by (a) the federal government, (b) the provincial government, and (c) the municipalities?

How many housing units have been started in these projects, how many have been completed and what is the average rental of the completed units?

Has there been any subsidization of the rents, and if so, what is the average subsidy per housing unit per year?

I would appreciate learning from you whether you believe the above information can be given to me."

To my letter I received a reply from the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) dated January 18th, 1951. I will put both letters completely on the record so there will be no suggestion I am reading out of the context. The hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) reads as follows:

"This will acknowledge your letter of the 20th of December 1950.

In respect of land assembly projects, agreements have been entered into with the cities of Windsor, London, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Thomas. These involve, all told about 650 acres of land and something in the order of 3000 lots will be made available to builders as a result thereof. At the present time we are negotiating agreements

March 28th, 1951

E-8

with the Town of Matheson and the Improvement District of Atikokan under which approximately another 300 serviced lots will be made available. As yet no lots have been offered for sale in any of these projects by reason of the fact that in most instances the services have yet to be installed. The lots will all be sold to builders or private individuals for the erection of houses thereon."

They had not even gotten around to offering lots for sale. In some instances the surveys were not being completed, and in all instances, the services have yet to be installed.

Then the letter goes on:

" In respect of construction of houses for sale if, as I presume you mean the erection of houses for sale by the Partners on direct account, no such projects have as yet been undertaken.

In respect of construction of houses for rent, no such projects have been requested by municipalities nor have any projects been undertaken."

That was the letter, signed by the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) on January 18th, 1951.

As you will notice, I asked him how many projects had been undertaken for the construction of houses for sale, and in his reply he said "I presume you mean the erection of houses for sale by the partners on direct account --

THE FIRST PART OF THE REPORT

OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

IN RESPONSE TO A RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
PASSED ON THE 11TH MARCH 1907
RELATIVE TO THE LANDS BELONGING TO THE CROWN
AND TO THE SEVERAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT

BY THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

LONDON: HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE, 1908.

1908

PRINTED BY THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

AND BY THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND ACT, 1908.

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

AND THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

ARE TO BE HAD OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

AND OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND ACT, 1908.

AND OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND ACT, 1908.

AND OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND ACT, 1908.

AND OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND ACT, 1908.

AND OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND ACT, 1908.

AND OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND ACT, 1908.

AND OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATIONERY OFFICE

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND ACT, 1908.

meaning the two governments -- and he has said that "No said projects have as yet been undertaken" and, as the hon. members will notice, the same answer was given in respect to projects for rent, so it is apparent that the houses which were built in the last year were not built on account of the legislation passed a year ago.

MR. FROST: Certainly they were.

MR. PARK: It was the regular construction going on by private builders, anyway, and all of those pious assertions, and all the boasting words, mean nothing whatsoever.

MR. FROST: As usual, the hon. member (Mr. Park) is completely astray.

MR. PARK: If I am astray, I have been led astray by the correspondence with the Department of Planning and Development. Perhaps if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had been available at that time, the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) would not have written that kind of a letter.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Park) had better put his dynamite on the table. Oh, I see he is going to put it on Hansard.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) can talk a greater amount of nonsense in a short time -- perhaps I should not say that, because he never makes any short statements -- but it is nonsense to the greatest degree.

The fact is that this province, in 1948, in order to assist in the erection of houses, brought in the second mortgage scheme which at that time the hon. member

March 28th, 1951

E-10

for Dovercourt (Mr. Park), talked about mortgages on mortgages, and said it was going to accomplish nothing. The fact is, it was good legislation, and it was soon after adopted by the Federal Government, and as a result, last year, in 1950 --

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

As a result, last year, in 1950 -- and I want the learned member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) to underline this -- the greatest number of houses in all the history of the province of Ontario were built, 33,000 housing units.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just about half enough.

MR. FROST: The fact is that so many houses were erected here in the province of Ontario that there was not enough material in Canada to keep up with it. The people in Ottawa had to step in to curtail the amount of house building here in the province of Ontario.

I will say Ontario is now ahead of all the provinces -- your province of Saskatchewan and all the rest of them rolled in together. This ~~old~~ province of Ontario is now the head of any^{of}/them. It is true that some of the municipalities steer away from what the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) calls "low-cost housing". I cannot blame any municipality, in the main, for doing that. I think they are better off in the development of their communities to keep on with better-class housing. That is what they are getting at the present time. In the city of Toronto, of course, you have a great problem. It ~~arise~~, of course, by reason of the very muddled municipapl system you have in this community, upon which I do not think I would want to comment. I think it is working out in a democratic way. Last year some of the hon. members on the opppsite side of this House talked about "big stick" methods. I remember the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) talked about the iron hand, about unification and amalgamation of this district. Those things have not come about. The people are working out solutions to their differences. You are going to get here in this community by ordinary methods/^awell-planned community in this

March 28, 1951.

F-2

area which will be a real source of satisfaction, not only to the people of this community but to the people of the province of Ontario. I would say to the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) that he ought to be proud of the great plans this province is making in this country.

MR. PARK: Does the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) remember the speech he made last year about the houses with no down payments, and does the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) remember the speech the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) made about 10 per cent down payments at \$580.? Those speeches were made in this House last year in persuading this House that it should give you authority you asked for in amendments to the Housing Act a year ago. The fact of the matter is that you have done not a single thing about it. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) boasts about the number of houses which have been built. To take care of the natural increase in our population we should have built at least 20,000 houses more than the number of which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) speaks. What the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is boasting about is not a success, but is a lack of success. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is telling us that because his government failed by 20,000 houses last year to meet the needs of the people of Ontario we should be happy and satisfied. It is not satisfactory and I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows it. As a matter of fact, with respect to the most important thing in the building of houses we have the one field in which where the government is timorous beyond all words. That is the question of financing the building of homes, which is the major cost in home building. The major cost in the building

March 28th, 1951.

F-3

and construction of a house is the financing of the construction of it. A \$10,000. mortgage carried over a period of twenty years, even at the National Housing rate, for $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, will cost \$14,500 on that mortgage. That is the highest single cost item in the construction of homes. It is precisely at that point that the government has failed to enter the housing field.

We are not going to tackle this question of housing until the Province of Ontario is prepared to establish a Public Housing Authority and go out and construct houses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: We should borrow money on the credit of this province at the lower interest rates, that this province can, because it is such a tremendously powerful province, in order to finance house construction. On that basis, we could, if we wanted to build houses and make them available to the people at rentals of \$40.00 over a thirty year period. We could build 10,000 houses without any subsidy from the province of Ontario. We can build low cost housing without going into the subsidy field, provided the government is prepared to take the initiative and have the imagination to meet the situation. Up to now, the government has been afraid, to tread on the toes of those who make money out of financing home construction. That is one place where the government is afraid to step on toes.

MR. GREISINGER: That is not a fact.

MR. PARKS: If it were not the government would be prepared to set up a public housing authority on that basis. The State

of New York can borrow money for 2% and $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ for short term loans. Surely if the City of New York can borrow money on that basis, the province of Ontario could do as well or nearly as well. We would be able to make homes available to nearly all people at reasonable rentals which they could pay over a long period of time. The government has lacked both the imagination to take that step, and I think the willingness --

MR. FROST: Would the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) give me the example of any government or city in Canada which has gone as far as the province of Ontario has in this type of construction?

MR. PARK: The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows very well that the housing situation is probably more critical in industrial areas of Ontario than in any other part of Canada. Surely the Hon. Prime Minister is not trying to make a comparison between Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Maritimes.

MR. PORTER: We hear a lot of other comparisons, In Montreal they have a terrific problem.

MR. PARKS: Their problems are minor, compared to the province of Ontario. Let the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) listen. He has taken a couple of leafs this Session out of American books. We got the Equal pay Bill and we got the F.E.P. bill.

MR. FROST: And I may say that the hon. member

F-5

for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) grumbled about both of them. There has not been one bill the government has introduced this year the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has not grumbled about. He is grumbling now.

MR. PARK: This is one subject about which I think everyone in this province would agree I have every reason to grumble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: Look around and get the trained seals clapping their hands.

MR. PARK: I mentioned the New York State Housing authority. In Detroit there are Housing Authorities working. In very many parts of the industrial areas of the United States Public Housing Authorities have been established. In Great Britain public Housing Authorities have been established. There are all kinds of precedents for undertaking this kind of effort. The fact of the matter is that this government has failed to take that action. It has failed, as I say, for two reasons, one that it lacks the imagination to give the necessary leadership in the matter, and, two -- and I think the more important of the two reasons -- is that some of the financial interests are most anxious the government stays out of the housing field, and this government is, therefore, more interested in pleasing them than seeing public need.

MR. GRIESINGER: We have had a number of re-

F-6

quests from different municipalities for low cost houses, and we have offered them practically the same kind of proposition they have in the United States and British Columbia -- the federal government 75%, the provincial government 12½%, and the municipality 12½%. We have even got it worked out to the point where we can tell them how much rent it will cost and how much will have to be subsidized; how much they would have to assume themselves; but we have not been asked by any of those municipalities since they first came in to make them a rental proposition. They have all accepted the Land Assembly Deal. Surely the hon. members of the Opposition are willing to give this government at least just a little bit of credit.

MR. FROST: Oh, no; not them.

MR. GREISINGER: On November 8 we have committed ourselves to spend approximately \$21,000,000. You take the provinces in the whole of the Dominion of Canada at the present time, and none of them has spent anywhere near that as a group, as a whole.

Let me point out, we support close to \$13,000,000 in second mortgages, which brought about the building of 15,000 homes. I think we deserve a little bit of credit there.

We gave an outright grant of \$1,275,000 for land and services, which we will never get back -- and which we do not want back.

In Regent Park we have committed ourselves to 1,062 units which will cost the province of Ontario

and, therefore, the taxpayers of Ontario, \$1,062,000.

In addition to that under Land Assembly Deal last year we have committed ourselves to \$1,000,000. We expect the same thing this year on Land Assembly Deal.

If the municipality wants it and are willing to pay their share, we are quite willing to go into it. I think we deserve at least a little bit of credit there.

It is easy enough to say "Build twenty or twenty-five thousand homes." I appreciate maybe that is what is needed, but under present conditions a house costs \$9,000. It is going to cost \$275,000,000 to start with.

At the present time, and I have discussed this with authorities in Ottawa, we know they have already said there will have to be a certain amount of defence housing in possibly Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa and several other places. Can we impose anything on top of that, when the Hon. Mr. Howe has already made the statement, "Unless you know where you are going to get your material, do not start building?" They are going to take that material for defence housing. I do not know whether we would be safe in imposing any real low rental housing on the province of Ontario at the present time.

Surely we deserve a little bit of credit for the money we have already spent.

MR. FROST: In Ontario we are far in the lead of every province in the Dominion of Canada. Do not

F-8

be so pessimistic. Cheer up.

MR. A. JOHNSTON (Parrie Sound): Mr.

Speaker --

MR. JOLLEFFE: Now we are going to hear from Parry Sound.

MR. JOHNSTON (Parry Sound): --- I would like to bring to the attention of the House the serious situation which exists in my district. I hear the hon. members talking about twenty thousand and fifty thousand houses and I can assure them none were built in Parry Sound.

(Take G follows.)

March 28th, 1951.

G-1

The insurance companies who are lending money -- and I understand with the blessing of the National Housing -- have in the last four years refused to lend mortgages in the smaller towns and villages.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is right.

MR. JOHNSTON: We have tried and tried --

MR. PARK: And your friend will do nothing for you, over here.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, I am hoping my hon. friends in the centre over here may help.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOHNSTON: We have tried through National Housing, Central Mortgage Corporation, and all of the insurance companies to obtain first mortgages in towns such as Burk's Falls, Powassan, South River -- towns about 1500 to 2000 people -- and their only reply has been that they have not offices set up to provide the administration of loaning this money.

Now we feel that since they are always able to set up offices to collect their insurance premiums, they should return the favour by spending a little money and helping the small communities to build themselves up. How are we going to get industries in these towns if we cannot supply houses?

MR. PARK: Public housing is your only answer.

MR. WALTERS (Bracondale): Better move over here.

MR. FROST: All this talk is not building any houses.

MR. JOHNSTON: I think the fault lies directly with the National Housing Act, because they guarantee that these insurance companies will not lose money, at least that is my interpretation of it. Therefore, if the insurance companies

G-2

are not going to lose any money, why will they not provide us with first mortgages. I do not understand. Perhaps someone has the answer, and I feel that I should bring it to the attention of the House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): I think the government is a little bit hard pressed to excuse point No. 8 of the notorious 22 points made in 1943.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: "To set up an Ontario Housing Commission for the purpose of wiping out slums".

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): That is the one you went out on -- the 22 points.

MR. THORNBERRY: And came back in.

MR. DUNBAR: Only been back a short time.

MR. THORNBERRY: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) does a very good job of trying to explain it away. I think instead of being a lawyer he should have been a Fuller Brush salesman.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: Because there seems to be a concerted effort not only on the part of the spokesmen of the government but also of the people that support them outside, principally the press, to gloss over their failure in supplying houses for the people who need them. Only last year, on March 7th, I quote one heading:

"No down payment -- "

MR. FROST: Might I ask my hon. friend the member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry), if his city of Hamilton

has approached us to ask us for any low-cost housing or any government subsidized housing.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us hear this first.

MR. THORNBERRY: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is particularly relevant.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: After all, the people send me here to tell you about it, and after all this is the place where action should be initiated. The local paper there said on March 7, 1950:

"No down payment needed in joint housing scheme. Premier Frost describes Dominion-Provincial dwelling erections planned".

MR. FROST: We are quite prepared to do this, we have offered to all the municipalities to pay 87 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the cost, between ourselves and the federal government; now, we are looking for some takers. You go home and sell the proposition over there.

MR. THORNBERRY: It might be all well and good to make this kind of an arrangement and let them lie there, but still the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) cannot tell this House how many homes have been built under that arrangement. The only thing that he can do is point to millions of dollars that have been loaned out in second mortgages. I suggest again -- I did so last year -- that that did not build a single house, and if we get to grips with the real problem, we could perhaps be in a position to initiate some action. The fact of the matter is that those houses built last year, those 33,000 houses would have been built in any case with

or without the second mortgage.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MR. THORNBERRY: With or without any financial assistance, and the only difference it would have made is that the type of people eligible to qualify for them -- that made a difference, that in itself created a problem because it made more competition, which forced prices up. And only 34 per cent of the materials spent in construction work in Ontario went into housing. The rest went into bowling alleys, cocktail bars, service stations, and enterprises of that nature, and I think that housing should have had some considerable priority.

Now in Hamilton, which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) enquires about, I was speaking to the head of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation just the other day, and he told me that there are 1,000 veterans who registered for vacancies in wartime housing.

AN hon. MEMBER: Why are they selling them then?

MR. THORNBERRY: That does not mean anything. The fact remains there are a thousand veterans registered who are without homes, living anywhere they can get. And that does not tell the whole story, because every three months a questionnaire is sent out to these veterans which they have to fill in and return in order to keep their name on the list. As happens very often, a number of them do not return them, so they are immediately cut off, and it would appear therefore we would be safe in assuming there are 1200 to 1500 veterans. If we add to that the number of other people who are waiting for homes, we get a very impressive figure. So what the government has to do is to get right down to the root of the situation in the

March 28, 1951.

G-5

housing need by dealing with the material shortage which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) mentioned.

What has the government done to relieve the material shortage? We have lumber in our northlands, we have clay to make bricks, and I do not think I am violating any confidence of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote) when he mentioned in private conversation that a brickyard was closed in his vicinity because it could not economically operate. That is one particular position where the provincial government should step in and take over that brickyard, as they have done in Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan government loses a few dollars on the operations --

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): They have got a sales tax out there.

MR. THORNBERRY: -- but the important thing is, Mr. Chairman, that it produces millions of bricks which go into housing.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THORNBERRY: That was important, and if we could do that in Ontario we would not have to go to Ohio, would not have to be carting bricks over here from Ohio. With the shortage of plumbing material, lumber and brick, the government is not concerned. Why does it not set up Crown corporations? We could finance those Crown corporations, we could raise the corporation tax, a little additional capital gain tax, and finance those Crown corporations to provide more bricks. And if we could provide the material, we will find that the people will be able to build their homes. After all, the 30,000 homes that were built, were built in spite

of the legislation, not because of the legislation.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) would care to comment on this short statement made by the new leader of the Liberal party of the province of Ontario?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: A statement bearing on this question.

MR. PORTER: Who is that? What is his name?

MR. MacLEOD: I will give you his name in a moment.

I am quoting from the Toronto Daily Star.

SOME hon. MEMBER: What's that?

MR. MacLEOD: "Walter Thompson, Ontario Liberal Leader, said last night that during the past eight years the Frost government had permitted to be ground into pulp and shipped to the United States/saw enough logs to have built 600,000 working men's homes".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: What do you have to say about that?

MR. FROST: Eyewash. I think Walter had better stick to his job down in Ottawa for awhile.

MR. PORTER: He is on a part-time job, so you might expect something like that.

MR. MacLEOD: That is a lot of homes -- 600,000.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I think that last year the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) told this House, and the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Griesinger) told this House that they had an entirely new plan up their sleeve, something entirely different from the promises of the 22 points. They had a new plan of

G-7.

constructing houses which would result in a great reduction in the cost and that plan which had been outlined to them by someone who at the time had convinced them it was practical and that it could be put into operation that plan, whatever it was, was a plan under which these houses costing \$5,800. were going to be built, with no down payment, or else with a very small 10 per cent down payment.

MR. GRIESINGER: Can you show me that?

MR. DENNISON: Yes.

MR. GRIESINGER: I would like to see it.

MR. DENNISON: Then, Mr. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) in the Throne Speech Debate, you told us that that plan had fallen through, that particular plan you had hoped for last year had fallen through.

MR. GRIESINGER : What plan are you referring to?

MR. DENNISON: I do not know, but --

MR. GRIESINGER: Then what are you talking about?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: No, no, Mr. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) you can surely remember your speeches and the hon. Prime Minister 's (Mr. Frost) speeches last year.

MR. GRIESINGER: I remember my speeches, but I do not recollect what you are talking about.

MR. DENNISON: Then you will remember the speech you made this Session on the Throne Speech, in which I said to you: "Then that \$5,800. house is out?", and you said: "Yes, that plan was impractical".

MR. GRIESINGER: That is right.

MR. DENNISON: You said that, you remember that? All right, I wonder if you would tell the House something

March 28th, 1951.

G-8

about this lower-cost method of house building that you had in mind, and I am wondering if that should not still be followed up, because I know in the U.S.A. they are initiating all ~~kind~~ of lower-cost house building plans by prefabrication, and by a number of other ideas that are reducing the costs.

I have a clipping here from the Star of November 16, 1945 in which it states that:

"In Leaside today a planned kitchen, bathroom, oil furnace, utility room were pushed through a hole in a house wall and set in operation in two hours. We are told further that the unit is believed by leading U.S. and Canadian building engineers and leaders in allied fields to be the first of its kind built anywhere in the world".

Now, putting this side by side with the Hon. Minister's (Mr. Griesinger) speech last year, I thought that surely we were in for some great new ~~era~~ of building construction in Ontario, where we were going to overhaul some of our --

MR. FROST: So we have done. Last year was the biggest building year in the history of Ontario, 33,000 homes.

MR. DENNISON: But you are using the old-time building methods --

MR. PORTER: We get them built.

MR. DENNISON: -- which are expensive and which you must admit yourself is resulting not in \$5,800. houses but \$10,000. houses. Now, there is a great difference between our standard construction methods and the methods which must have been in your mind last year when you made this suggestion. I wonder if you should not take the House into your confidence and tell us something about that.

G-9

MR. MacLEOD: If they have any confidence left.

MR. DENNISON: In closing I would like also to point out to the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) that the one item he has in here for assembly land, last year he had \$1,140,000. in that item, this year he has reduced it to \$1,112,000., so that instead of expanding this House building program, such as it is, you are contracting it.

MR. GRIESINGER: I would not say so.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL(York East): Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this afternoon's debate with a great deal of interest, and it reminds me of debates I heard 20 years ago. In this matter I do not think we should take a political attitude, but if we do, both the old parties have to carry an equal amount of blame. I sat in the House of Commons all through the depression years, when it was beginning and the Liberal party was in power and then when the Conservative party came into power between 1930 and 1939.

MR. MacLEOD: And then it did go bad.

MISS MACPHAIL: And there were the labourers who were idle and could not find work, could not find food, could not find anything. There was plenty of material and nothing was done about it by either of them. Then, Mr. Chairman, they could not find money. Then the war came along and there was no difficulty about the money, but then they could not get the material and could not get the men.

I think what you need is a good, big delegation of women in both the federal and provincial Houses, because they would not do things the way they have been done. But the men love to talk.

MR. FROST: Hear, hear.

March 28, 1951.

G-10

MR. PORTER: Some men.

AN hon. MEMBER: Particularly the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost).

MISS MACPHAIL: And every time I hear someone say women are the talkers, I think of the parliaments I have sat in.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I will say for my hon. friend the member for East York (Miss Macphail), she does not waste the time of the House, like some of her colleagues over there do, and she nearly always speaks to the point.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is right.

MR. FROST: It is a great pleasure to hear her.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN hon. MEMBERS: Send her another bouquet for her birthday.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And she is not responsible for foolish headlines about houses without down payments.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, the question is, were there any houses built under the amending legislation of last year?

MR. MacLEOD: That is the question I asked.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) tell me how many houses were built under the legislation of 1949-1950? Not one house.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, if I may put a very fair question to the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger); the fact remains that the greatest sufferers as a consequence of the housing shortage are the families,

169

100

G-11

large families particularly. Those are the ones where the families have been broken up, they can no longer meet the rent and even though they could meet the existing rentals, the landlords are not prepared to rent to them, so that in the final analysis our housing shortage is destroying our family life. And that is a serious social problem which everybody recognizes, and I am sure this government recognizes, and the only solution I know to that problem is the construction of subsidized housing for this type of people, families that cannot meet our existing rent structure.

(Page G-12 follows)

So I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) in view of the fact that when he returned from his trip to England and he reviewed the English programme of subsidized housing, his first statement was that he was very much opposed to subsidized housing in any form, I want now to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) what is the plan of his government in respect to the housing for that type of people?

MR. FROST: May I just ask my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) a question. He is on the council for the city of Windsor and we have offered the city of Windsor to enter into an arrangement with them which would leave them paying the balance of 12½% only of subsidized housing and rentals. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) has the city council of which he is a member advanced any proposal to us to enter into any such deal as that?

MR. ELLIS: I will answer the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). We went into a programme of land assembly with the Department last year.

MR. FROST: That is right. How about subsidized housing?

MR. ELLIS: All right, wait a minute. And we have not got even the first sewer in yet. I believe the surveys are now completed.

MR. GRIESINGER: Remember what your Mayor said to his city engineer, that he thought he was lazy. Was that in the paper or was it not? You are a controller, you should know.

MR. ELLIS: The fact remains we have not even got that 80 acres assembled yet for housing.

MR. FROST: That is right. What is wrong with the city engineer?

MR. ELLIS: Because of the tragic loss of time in getting that land assembly completed, we are now in the process of trying to find 500 improved lots within the confines of the city to come and ask for a subsidized housing project. We will be here very shortly.

MR. FROST: Well, you have not yet made a proposal to us. Have you?

MR. ELLIS: What is the use?

MR. FROST: Your council or yourself have not made a proposal yet to us in connection with subsidized housing, have you? No. Well, that is just an example right there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr Chairman--

MR. FROST: That shows you how the CCF operate. They do nothing but talk. They talk and do nothing.

MR. PORTER: When they have a chance, they do nothing.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, has it occurred to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) that if there has been little response from the municipality since last year, perhaps their legislation is no good?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Has that thought ever crossed their minds?

MR. FROST: The hon. member for Windsor (Mr. Ellis) says that he was so discouraged by the dilatory tactics of the city engineer that he was discouraged from coming to ask for subsidized housing.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What we have heard today is that the legislation of last year has not brought forth much of a response from the municipalities. That may be quite true, and there may be many reasons, many, many reasons for that disappointment. I may say that it is not very surprising to us on this side. We did not think last year that all the propaganda about last year's legislation would bring the results which were forecast at the time, the results forecast in the

speeches made at the time and even more rashly forecast in newspaper headlines. Now it comes to this, that if municipal cooperation is desirable--and I think it is--if provincial-Federal collaboration is to be desired, then the legislation passed last year--and when I say that, I refer not only to the legislation passed here, but to legislation passed at Ottawa --is not very successful legislation.

These things have to be judged by the results. What I do not understand about the government's attitude is what was said more than once regarding the number of houses built last year, and I would ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) this question. He may take pride in the number that were built last year. Does he think they were adequate? Does he think that number comes anywhere near meeting the need of Ontario? What does he propose to do about it?

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, it is not what I think, I am a realist; the fact is that in Ontario last year we built the huge sum of 33,165 houses.

MR. MILLARD: Who is "we"?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: "We"?

MR. FROST: Just wait a moment. It is not what I think. At the end of the year, we had 27,522 houses uncompleted, for which there was not material. So that as a matter of fact last year in Ontario, in 1950, we built every house we could possibly build in this province, and we had 27,512 unfinished at the end of the year.

MR. THORNBERRY: What are you doing about that?

MR. FROST: What is the use of telling me or asking me whether I think it is sufficient. The fact is we built every possible house we could build.

Mr. Chairman, I notice it is five o'clock, and hon. members will remember what I said last night. All of this

talk we have had here this afternoon does not build any houses, it does not complete that 27,512 houses.

MR. THORNBERRY: It shows whose responsibility it is, though, to build them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This year or last year?

MR. FROST: How about getting the balance of this Estimate through, because we have a pretty busy day tomorrow. I would like to adjourn the House now, it is five o'clock, but I think we could run through the balance of this now. I think my hon. friend the member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) might be talked out by this time, and perhaps we could finish this.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger), in regard to the question I directed to him a little while ago: Are you prepared now to say that the Department of Planning and Development will undertake an intensive survey of the housing needs of this province within the next two or three months?

MR. GRIESINGER: We are doing that all the time. I think I can give you figures on that.

MR. MacLEOD: Why is it you cannot tell us something about the precise--

MR. GRIESINGER: I haven't the figures, though I can get them for the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod).

MR. THORNBERRY: Mr. Chairman, I think it has been clearly established this afternoon that X amount of material can only build X number of houses, and that regardless of the legislation that has been passed here or elsewhere, there would have been no more homes built; so that the problem to meet is, what does the Department of Planning and Development intend to do about producing more materials? If we get extra material we will build extra homes, and there will not be the unfinished homes the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) speaks of.

MR. GRIESINGER: It does not come under our authority.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): What?

MR. GRIESINGER: We have nothing to do with building materials.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Have you nothing to do with the saw logs?

MR. FROST: Have you been talking to Doctor Johnston?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, but there were saw logs in this province long before Johnston and long before all the others who have talked about it.

MR. THORNBERRY: There has been a material shortage since 1945. What has the government done about alleviating the shortage of material?

MR. FROST: The shortage of material is in steel, it is not lumber, it is in steel and steel products and allied products.

MR. THORNBERRY: There is no doubt there is a shortage of steel at this particular stage, but what happened the other years? It is quite evident the government does not intend under any circumstances to trespass on the field of private enterprise in the building of homes, and they are supported in that view by the press who give us misleading statements of speeches made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), like:

"No down payment needed in joint housing scheme."

As it appeared. There has also nothing been done about obtaining building mechanics.

MR. MacLEOD: What paper was it that carried that story?

MR. THORNBERRY: The Hamilton Spectator, March 7th, 1950.

MR. PARK: The Globe & Mail, too.

MR. THORNBERRY: "No down payment needed----", in large headlines. In Great Britain they turn out 90,000 mechanics

every three months, and feed them into the building industry.

MR. FROST: They have the greatest building shortage in the world there.

AN hon. MEMBER: Yes, because of the houses destroyed during the war.

MR. MILLARD: The most disgraceful statement I ever heard in my life, that of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

MR. THORNBERRY: But what the House wants to hear, Mr. Chairman, from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) is what they intend to do to alleviate the material shortage in order to build homes, because legislation will not build homes if there is no material. That legislation may have been of some value during the depression years---when there was an abundance of material and if people could have been assisted financially they would have built homes, but it won't build homes today, so we have to get down to producing more material. What will the Department do about it?

MR. GRIESINGER: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thornberry) what he would suggest doing? He must have a suggestion.

MR. FROST: He would pass the 40-hour week.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) mentioned that he had no request from the municipality for these kind of projects.

MR. FROST: Nothing from Oshawa yet, or Hamilton.

MR. THORNBERRY: In respect to that, Mr. Chairman---excuse me--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THORNBERRY: In Hamilton, because of the restricted franchise, they have a Tory council there that just wants to embarrass this government.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Some of these municipalities would have made approaches to the government had they not insisted themselves in investigating the project. About two and a half months ago a committee was set up of three members by the city council of Oshawa to investigate this very same project and after about two months of investigating, they reported back to the council that there was nothing in it, that is all.

MR. FROST: In other words, they didn't want anything to do about it. What can we do?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): No, there was nothing in it.

MR. R. SCOTT (Beaches): I wonder if I could direct a question to the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger)--I am not just sure who that is at the moment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Ch, oh.

MR. FROST: You are never sure of anything, anyway.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): It is a simple question to the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger). How many houses have been built in Ontario under the Housing amendments passed last year--how many houses?

MR. GRIESINGER: Well, that is the third time.

MR. FROST: Some place around 33,165.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): How many houses, can the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) answer?

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): That is a simple question, surely.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: They do not know.

MR. FROST: 33,000.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Can we not get an answer to that simple question.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: No.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labor): No, it is a

silly question.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. If the government will agree, in view of the fact that it is after five and there is something important on, I would undertake when we reconvene to explain the government's position--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: --to the full satisfaction of the House in ten minutes, that is all. And the government will, I am sure, then recognize that everything that can be said has been said.

MR. FROST: Vote 130.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. MILLARD: 130--I would like to accommodate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), who, I understand, has a pressing engagement this evening, but it is going to take a few moments to explain the lack of memory on the part of the present hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) with regard to certain things that he said in 1948.

MR. FROST: Oh, we will take that as read. We have passed that item now.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: No.

MR. MILLARD: No, you have not, and as far as I am concerned, you are not going to pass it until I get the record straight. If you want to take the time now, we will go ahead now.

MR. FROST: That is asking an impossibility, to ever get the record straight with my hon. friend (Mr. Millard).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. FROST: He cannot be straightened.

MR. MILLARD: Mr Chairman, I would like to read this from the Toronto Daily Star, Thursday, June 17th, 1948.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: The Toronto Star?

MR. MILLARD: The headline---I have said before, the Toronto Star is not unfriendly to the government.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is this on?

MR. MILLARD: This is on item 5.

MR. FROST: What is the use of threshing over old straw?

MR. MILLARD: Because the authorities of this province want to know where they are going and what they can depend on now.

MR. FROST: I have given you a clear statement and my hon. friend (Mr. Millard) might as well understand. We are willing and we are entering into a big partnership agreement with the Federal and municipal authorities; our contribution is to be 37½%, the Federal will be 37½% and the municipal 25%. That is the ticket anybody can come in on.

That is the situation.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to take the opportunity to refresh the memory of the government in their promises.

AN hon. MEMBER: We know you can read.

MR. MILLARD: The headline is:

"Will double----"

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is carried.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: Out of order.

MR. MILLARD: I declare it was not passed.

AN hon. MEMBER: We know you can read.

MR. FROST: Let us hear what our hon. friend (Mr. Millard) has to say.

MR. MILLARD: The headline here is:

"Will double 37½ P. C. offer for Humber
plan----Porter"

That is the headline. I will give the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) a few quotes from the text. Now the plan of the Humber dams is reported at the occasion at the Old Mill on this particular date:

"Recommendations included in the report are:

Construction of six medium-sized dams and numerous smaller ones throughout Humber Valley to prevent spring floods and increase summer flow of water; creation of six large parks and eighteen smaller ones comprising over 4000 acres and with a daily capacity of over 14,000 people; establishment of a 20,000-acre forest in Albion Township, and a comprehensive programme to increase wild life in the area."

And in connection with that recommendation of the Humber Valley Authority that was set up by this government or its predecessor, the administration, with a great deal of fanfare as to what these Valley Authorities were going to do, I might say, Mr. Chairman, I am tremendously interested in the question of the Humber Valley Authority improvement plan.

(Take H follows)

H-1

Here is a statement as it appears, which I put on the record last year, and remind it to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) about it today, but he comes before us now and says quite bluntly that he cannot recollect making any statement. It is a year ago now -- in fact, March 29th, a year less one day, that I read part of the statement.

MR. PORTER: I do not think I was in the House when you read it last year. I do not recall it. That was a year ago. Lots of water has run under the bridge since then.

MR. MILLARD: That is true, and a lot of erosion has gone on during the past year, and it shows how little attention has been paid to the report of the Conservation Committee, which had devoted considerable time to that subject. This goes on to say:

"While federal government experts study the feasibility of provincial flood control plans, Queen's Park will double its original offer of $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent toward the cost of projects so that municipalities will contribute only 25 per cent. This was announced last night by Hon. Dana Porter, minister of Planning and Development, as the report of the Humber Valley Conservation Authority was made public.

'We are prepared to advance a further 37; per cent, over our first $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, pending the decision of the Federal government,' Mr. Porter said. 'Any authority

can now be assured of 75 per cent of the costs from one or the other central governments or both.'

He said in reforestation the province would supply trees, plant and maintain them, fence the area and contribute one-half the cost of land. The municipality would be responsible for the other half of land acquired, he said.

'This financing of the river valley conservation projects and reforestation will be done because we regard them of sufficient importance', the minister declared. 'I believe it is in the interests of the province to see these works go ahead without undue delay.'"

And two years later the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) responsible for that statement, publicly made and reported in the press, said, "I cannot even recall it". It was so important, that he cannot recall it.

I say that this government supplying, under item 5 of the estimate, \$130,000 for the River Valley Conservation surveys and authorities in this province, is just pure bluff, on their part.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: You did not mean a word of what you said, and you are just "passing the buck" in regard to doing the job.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

10

March 28th, 1951

H-3

VOTES 131 to 134 agreed to.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I have been on my feet. I wanted the opportunity --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Carry it.

MR. SALSBERG: I wanted to have an opportunity to say a few words when we reached the item on "Immigration", and I would ask that we not rush this number.

MR. FROST: Would this meet the convenience of the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg)? We have four estimates left, and I think we could complete those tomorrow, which would enable us to clear up the Bills on the Order Paper on Friday. On Monday we can then go ahead with the Budget Debate, which will give the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) his annual opportunity to flay the government's financial policy, and he can raise the question of immigration at that time. I think if we can make the progress which we should make, we ought to be able to proceed fairly rapidly. Tomorrow with the Departments of Agriculture, and Labor. Labor has been discussed until it is threadbare, and I imagine there will be very little objection to the estimates.

MR. SALSBERG: You will be surprised.

MR. FROST: There will be a special meeting of the Lands and Forests Committee tomorrow morning, and I would ask the hon. members to be there, and ask all the questions they desire. That leaves only the office of the Provincial Treasurer, and I think we might clear up the balance of the Order Paper, leaving Monday clear for the Election Bill, for the balance of the Budget debate, and the formal Bills which come in at the closing of the Legislature.

That seems to be about the order of things, and I think we might try to proceed along that line.

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

1009 1009 1009

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report progress.

MR. SALSBERG: I was going to say that I agree, out of consideration to the Press Gallery, but there is so much to flay the government for, I thought I might get one item off my mind at this time.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report the Committee has come to a certain resolution, and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.17 of the clock p.m.

- - - - -

REPORT ON THE PROGRESS OF THE WORK DURING THE YEAR 1900

The work of the Department during the year 1900 has been characterized by a steady and continuous progress in all the various branches of the service. The most important results have been the completion of the Census of the Marine Mammals, the publication of the Census of the Fishes, and the completion of the Census of the Birds. The work of the Department has also been characterized by a steady and continuous progress in the various branches of the service, and the results of this work have been published in the various reports of the Department.

The Census of the Marine Mammals, which was completed in the month of June, 1900, is the first census of this kind ever made in the United States. It was made by the United States Fish Commission, and the results of this census are published in the report of the Commission for the year 1900. The Census of the Fishes, which was completed in the month of July, 1900, is the first census of this kind ever made in the United States. It was made by the United States Fish Commission, and the results of this census are published in the report of the Commission for the year 1900. The Census of the Birds, which was completed in the month of August, 1900, is the first census of this kind ever made in the United States. It was made by the United States Fish Commission, and the results of this census are published in the report of the Commission for the year 1900.

The work of the Department has also been characterized by a steady and continuous progress in the various branches of the service, and the results of this work have been published in the various reports of the Department. The work of the Department has also been characterized by a steady and continuous progress in the various branches of the service, and the results of this work have been published in the various reports of the Department.



PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

— • —

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

— • —

Volume XXXVIII.

THURSDAY, MARCH 29th, 1951

— • —

March 29th, 1951.

A-2

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, it is my duty to bring to the attention of the House a matter of grave importance to the public and to ourselves. I think I may take as my starting point an editorial and an article which appeared in the "Financial Post" for March 31st, 1951, and which I did not see until this morning.

These articles, Mr. Speaker, relate to the history of an organization known as the "United Emergency Fund for Britain". I may say that the things which appear in the Post are not entirely new to me, because in recent weeks I have been making some enquiry in this matter myself, and I was able independently to obtain some of the information -- although not all of it -- which now appears in the Post.

I should explain, Mr. Speaker, that this is a case of an Organization incorporated under a Charter from the Dominion government early in the year 1948, which appealed to the public in Ontario and other provinces for financial contributions for a charitable purpose -- and a highly-laudable purpose, in the main, the purpose of forwarding to the people of Britain some

March 29th, 1951.

A-3

supplementary assistance which would help to relieve them at a time of their food shortages, and at a time when the people of the United Kingdom were subject to food rationing.

This,,of course, Mr. Speaker, is not the only case of charity in recent months which has come under public criticism, by reason of the conduct of its affairs. It is not the only case, but it is clearly an outstanding and important case, and I raise it now because I think it merits the most serious consideration of all the hon. members of this House and this government, and because I have a suggestion to make which I think will go some distance toward meeting the problem represented by this type of charity.

The House will, I think, appreciate the gravity of the matter if I quote from an editorial of the Financial Post:

Under the heading "On Lending Your Name to Charity", we find the following:

"On Page 13 of this issue we publish the story of a charity operation which deserves the attention of the thousands of prominent Canadians who give their time, their money and the prestige of their names to the promotion of good causes.

Here was a money-raising campaign which brought in approximately \$593,000. Main purpose of the fund, the public understood, was these contributions would be used to send food parcels to Britain.

But of the \$593,000. raised, the accounts show that only \$880. was spent on food for Britain. Other expenditures included some \$185,364 for salaries, \$188,533 for advertising and publicity, \$78,000. for travel, with further amounts for other administrative expenses.

A publicity firm operated by the chief administrative officer of the fund received some \$83,000.

So most of the money went, not for providing Britons with food parcels, but for encouraging other people and other organizations to send Britons food parcels, clothing, etc.

Revelations of this kind are full of instruction for prominent and well-meaning people who go on charity boards of directors, committees, etc. First, they should find out very clearly the origins, personnel and purposes of the charity wanting them. Secondly, if they accept, they should see to it that they really know how the business affairs are being conducted.

Important, too is the fact that, like any well-run business, the development of a charitable organization should be gradual and sound. Quite obviously costs which may be reasonable for raising \$10 millions would be out of proportion for a \$1 million fund.

March 29th, 1951.

A-5

Trying to do too much too fast is as dangerous for a charity as it is for a business.

GIVERS DESERVE ALL THE FACTS

Publication of the facts about the fund here described, the United Emergency Fund for Britain, as did our report on the Canadian Foundation for Poliomyelitis will doubtless add to the growing demand for some national agency which will license or otherwise "clear" appeals for public funds.

As matters now stand you or anybody else can make a public appeal for any purpose whatever and do with the receipts whatever you wish.

There are some good things but we think many bad things about any mandatory licensing scheme.

But there is a great deal of merit in the system growing in the United States of privately operated charity information offices manned by people experienced in such work and with a rigid set of standards for a charity's performance. To such organizations business firms and individuals can go for information as to where they can do the most real good with their charity dollars.

Most charitable objectives are unquestionably good, and most charities are efficiently and economically run. But the public now being

A-6

subjected to so many claims for its extra dollars is more than ever interested in getting all the facts."

Mr. Speaker, that concludes the editorial, but in the second section of the Financial Post it gives a detailed description of the origin, history and result of the United Emergency Fund for Britain. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I have been able to go into this matter, the facts as stated in the Financial Post coincide with the facts I discovered independently.

I do not propose to read to the House the whole story of this extraordinary charity, but I think some features of it should be brought to the attention of the House now. I hope every hon. member of the House will read in full the article in the Financial Post, because it is most illuminating, and will bring home to all of us a situation which I think is of the greatest importance.

They received a charter in 1948. It was not subject to the War Charities Act of the Dominion, because the War Charities Act of the Dominion which was in force during the war, and which was concerned with any charity having among its objects any purpose, charitable or otherwise, arising from or connected with the war, but did not continue in effect so far as a project of this kind is concerned, after June of 1947.

The War Charities Act was amended in 1947 to provide that it would apply only in respect of war charity funds "registered prior to the coming into of this Act" in June, 1947, so the United Emergency Fund for Britain, formed in 1948, was in no way subject to the Dominion Act

and in no way subject to Federal supervision, except, of course, it did receive a Federal Charter. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, so many prominent and important people lent their names as sponsors of the United Emergency Fund for Britain, that the Dominion Government itself made a grant of \$30,000. to the U.E.F.B.

As has been explained, the purpose of the fund was to send food parcels to needy Britons, and it was operated at a time when it was hoped that bulk purchases in Canada would result in a saving, that is to say, it was felt that by purchasing food in a large way, it could be purchased more economically than could an individual Canadian purchasing small quantities of food to send overseas.

The Fund, through the government, was also able to make arrangements with the British government for special rates for transportation. That was brought out as another reason why people should send their parcels through the U.E.F.B.

The fund set out to raise \$7,000,000, an impossible objective, one which could only be dreamed up in the mind of a high powered promoter. The objective was reduced to \$5,000,000, and later on reduced again, but unfortunately, when the objective was reduced, the expenses were not reduced, the gap amounted day by day, and somewhere along the road the promoters decided that their appeal to send food for needy Britons was failing, and they therefore changed the functions of the fund. They went into business in a commercial way, they formed what was known as "Canaid", and they acted as agents for

March 29th, 1951.

A-8

people sending food to Britain. It is claimed that over \$1 million worth of food and clothing was forwarded to Britain under the agency of "Canaid", which was really under the auspices of U.E.F.B. But that was all paid for. That was in addition to nearly \$600,000 raised by U.E.F.B. while the actual amount spent on food shipped to Britain was about \$880. -- \$880. in food parcels to Britain, with receipts of about \$600,000.

This change in policy was made by the promoters without notice to the public and apparently without knowledge of the fund's most active supporters.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pause at this point to say that this fund had the unselfish support of a great many of our best citizens, who were acting in regard to it in good faith; as far as they were concerned, it was a labor of love, and they cannot be blamed for what happened. They did not know what was going on; they did not know what the expenses of the fund were; they were assured by Mr. Daly and others associated with him that there were 75 active branches of this organization in Ontario alone. When the women's auxiliary was formed, to coordinate the efforts of the women who were working on it -- and working hard -- they made their own enquiries and they found that there were not 75 branches, but, as a matter of fact, there were only about 3, and they became extremely dissatisfied with the situation. The result was that the women formed an executive, and were given some recognition by the Board.

In July of last year the women, having made a good many enquiries of their own, came to the conclusion that

The whole project was being operated in such an unsound and unsatisfactory manner that it should be wound up, and it was on their insistence that after two auditors' reports were taken, which began to reveal the truth, it was decided in the summer of last year to wind up the affairs of this fund, and cease doing business.

There are many shocking details which I can give to the House, but which I will not take the time to do now. I think every hon. member of the House should read the articles in the Post in full, and I give my assurance, from my own enquiry, that the articles in the Post are founded on a great deal of hard work and the facts given are the result of research, and cannot be contradicted.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take up much more time going into details, because I have said enough already to indicate how serious it is. But I do have a suggestion to make about our own relationship to this affair, and its activities. In the first place, it is apparent there exists a gap in our law and in the administration of the law with respect to charity. There is no machinery set up to protect the public against appeals which may be fraudulent or semi-fraudulent, or questionable, or unsound. If I may draw an analogy -- not a perfect one -- there was a time when we had little or no legislation and little or no machinery to protect the public against fraudulent or semi-fraudulent stock promotions. Some 30 years ago -- was it not? -- or less, it was found necessary to pass a Security Frauds Prevention Act. Later the Securities Act came into force and we set up an office under the wing of the Attorney-General

March 29th, 1951.

A-10

to protect the public against the operations of unscrupulous promoters and salesmen. We have no corresponding protection with respect to charity, and we have reached a point in the development of our society, where the number of ingenious men who live and flourish by their wits rather than by honest work, appears to be increasing, and amongst those, are a number who undertake the promotion of any kind of organization and enterprise ostensibly for the public good, but primarily for their own aggrandizement. That appears to be what happened in this case. Their technique in the United States is that they invariably invite prominent and highly regarded citizens to lend their names to some worthy cause, as they think. Naturally, public spirited citizens are usually willing to lend their names to the promotion of a worthy cause.

I regret to inform the hon. members of the House that some of our most prominent and experienced businessmen were on the Board of the U.E.F.B., and being busy with other things, or possibly for reasons of convenience, they did not know precisely what was being done by management, with disastrous results.

May I inform the House as I did on a previous occasion, that there is precedent in law for stating that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) has a measure of responsibility with respect to charities. I do not think, however, the duty vested in the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) by precedent goes far enough. May I refer again to the New Zealand case, in which Lord McNaughton referred to the responsibility of the Attorney

March 29th, 1951.

A-11

General in that regard. I am quoting a statement from Halsbury's Laws of England, Second Edition, Volume 4, at page 339, where we find the following:

"The Crown, as *parens patriae* is the constitutional protector of all properties subject to charitable trusts, such a trust being essentially a matter of public concern. And the Attorney General, who represents the Crown for all forensic purposes, is accordingly the proper person to take proceedings on behalf of and to protect charities."

That is about as far as it goes. There is no doubt that the proper person to initiate action with respect to charities is the Attorney General, sometimes upon the relation of a private citizen. But we do not have the machinery which would enable the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) to take any action which should be initiated, and that seems to me the most important point which arises at the present time. Indeed, I do not know of any case in Canada where the Attorney General has initiated an action of this kind, but undoubtedly he is the person to do it, if it is to be done.

Secondly, we do have some legislation in this province relating to charities, but it does not seem to cover a case of this kind. As we all know, we have the Charitable Gifts Act which is not relevant here, and we have the Charitable Institution Act 22

MR. FROST: What about the Charities' Accounting Act?

March 29th, 1951.

A-12

MR. JOLLIFFE: I was about to mention the Charities' Accounting Act. I have examined that Act with some care. It might be argued it would cover a case of this kind, but I am not sure it could be so argued successfully, because the Charity Accounting Act relates to trusts created by will or other instrument in writing. I suppose one might say that the U.E.F.B. was operating under a Federal Charter which was an instrument in writing within the meaning of the Act but I am not sure that is right and I do not think the Act goes far enough to deal effectively with a case of this kind.

During a debate in this House two years ago, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) indicated that the government intended to pass regulations under the Charities' Accounting Act. Indeed, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) spoke at second reading of the Charitable Gifts Act, and made that very clear. He said specifically that regulation would be passed under the Charities' Accounting Act.

I have here a quotation from the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on March 25th, 1949, at page 1336 of Hansard, where he said:

"Having the above in mind, it is the intention of the government, by means of regulations under the Charities' Accounting Act, to provide that all charitable trusts and foundations shall file with the proper officer financial statements relating to the operations of such trusts so that the public which is interested through its

March 29th, 1951.

A-13

contributions by way of succession duty exemptions and the charities which are interested as beneficiaries under the trusts, shall have the fullest information as to what is taking place. This object, however, is in addition to the purposes of this particular bill which deals with another aspect of the problem which, under present conditions, has become more apparent."

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

I subsequently referred to that statement of the Prime Minister. I think I described it as "Window Dressing", and pointed out that no regulations had yet been adopted under The Charities Accounting Act. I find to-day, more than two years later, that no regulations have yet been adopted, or at least filed under The Charities Accounting Act. So I wonder what happened to all the good intentions of two years ago. I am beginning to suspect I was right when I described that statement two years ago as "Window Dressing".

Apart from that question, I do not think that the Charities Accounting Act or regulations that might be passed thereunder would be sufficient or adequate. I am going to make this suggestion to the Government, after having given this matter considerable study over the past two weeks, and having passed thought seriously about what might be the best answer, that the time has come when there should be a complete review of the whole problem relating to the promotion of charities and the supervision of charities. I have asked myself whether this would be appropriate for enquiry by a select committee of this House, perhaps by the committee which is to be appointed at this Session, a committee appointed to enquire into law enforcement and the administration of justice; but I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the Government is going to agree with me, that an enquiry such as this into a specific problem, which I think should be a very thorough enquiry by one of our better mind, could best be made if the Government were to use its powers under the Public

The first of these is the fact that the

the second is the fact that the

the third is the fact that the

the fourth is the fact that the

the fifth is the fact that the

the sixth is the fact that the

the seventh is the fact that the

the eighth is the fact that the

the ninth is the fact that the

the tenth is the fact that the

the eleventh is the fact that the

the twelfth is the fact that the

the thirteenth is the fact that the

the fourteenth is the fact that the

the fifteenth is the fact that the

the sixteenth is the fact that the

the seventeenth is the fact that the

the eighteenth is the fact that the

the nineteenth is the fact that the

the twentieth is the fact that the

the twenty-first is the fact that the

Inquiries Act, to commission a very able judge to go into the whole problem, to inquire into the history of two or possibly three of the recent promotions which have gone on the rocks --- and I think it is correct and fair to say that both the March of Dimes and the United Emergency Fund for Britain went on the rocks --- to inquire into the history of these organizations, so that their techniques may be analysed, so that we may learn exactly how they operate and why they come to grief; and secondly, having done all this, to recommend to the government appropriate legislation and the proper machinery to grapple with this problem.

Previously at this Session, there has been some mention of royal commissions.

(PAGE B-3 FOLLOWS)

I think I made it clear that in my view they are appropriate on some occasions and not on others. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion when a full inquiry by a Judge would be perhaps the best method of discovering the correct answer to a difficult problem. I think such an inquiry should not be restricted or inhibited in any way by the unfortunate fact that some of our leading citizens allowed their names to be identified with the fiasco known as the United Emergency Fund for Britain. I have no desire to pillory anybody in this connection; on the contrary, I have a great deal of sympathy with the citizens, particularly the women who worked so hard in support of the United Emergency Fund for Britain. On the other hand, I say, as the Financial Post has said, that the leading citizens who lend their names to such enterprises must hereafter accept more responsibility for what happens. I just do not see any other answer to it.

Finally, may I point out that nothing is more certain to dry up the sources of charitable support than developments such as we have had in the case of this charity and others. There is no more set way of convincing the public that it is useless to give your money towards a good cause, because you never know how it will be handled. I am very hopeful that the Prime Minister and the Government will agree that we have come to the point where something just has to be done about this, both for the protection of the public and for the protection of beneficiaries of charitable enterprises. I hope the Government will also agree that any machinery which now exists is wholly inadequate to meet the problem before us.

March 29th, 1951.

B-4

Hon. LESLIE H. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have just received a portion of the Financial Post dated March 31st, so that my friend apparently gets his copy of this paper before I do. This is only the 29th of March.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I got it just about an hour and a half ago.

Hon. MR. FROST: Now, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with what my hon. friend has said. This problem is very great. I think that perhaps my hon. friend and myself, in considering this great problem, because it is a great problem, find ourselves closer together to-day than we have been on other occasions.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. FROST: I think that my hon. friend thought he'd offended. I agree with my hon. friend that this is a very great problem indeed, -- the extent to which charities in Canada and the United States are or can be used for purposes other than charity. I think the problem deserves our very greatest and most thorough attention.

I am interested in the proposition made by the Financial Post relative to some type of national registration. On the other hand, I agree with my hon. friend that it does not seem that the good faith and the operation of so-called charitable projects such as these can be left entirely to the Federal Government or agents of that Government. I think they will have to receive some attention from us here. As my hon. friend intimated, we have in force in Ontario at least two Acts which naturally come to our minds in this connection. One is the Charities

Accounting Act. I am rather inclined to agree with my hon. friend that the cases he had stated do not come within the scope of that Act, but they may.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not sure.

MR. FROST: I am not sure. Then we have, of course, the Charitable Gifts Act of two years ago, dealing with quite a different phase of this many-sided problem.

Since our discussion in relation to another phase of this matter, some two years ago, the Public Trustee, Mr. Racine, has paid a lot of attention to this problem, and I can say that progress has been made in the matter from an administrative standpoint which really had not been contemplated at that time. It may be --- and we have been giving consideration to this --- that the Charities Accounting Act should be streamlined, that the scope of the Act and the nature and extent of its operation, should be advanced a little and enlarged. I think that in the last two years, we have acquired experience through the Public Trustee's Office which might justify some type of registration within the Province. My hon. friend recognizes, of course, the difficulty that attaches to Provincial registration. I do not say that these difficulties are in such a way that they would rule out taking that course. But, as he well knows, many charities are national in scope. Take for instance, such a great charity as the Red Cross; it is national in scope; and it might not be desirable to have subject to Provincial registration an organization such as that. On the other hand, it might be.

March 29th, 1951.

B-6

Furthermore, there is the consideration that the Federal Government gives exemptions for Income Tax by reason of charitable donations and gifts. I think it is desirable that if there is to be a registration of this sort, it should run parallel with what the Federal Administration say in that regard.

As regards the case, in point, Mr. Speaker, I have had a copy of this paper and I have shown it to the Attorney General. First of all, we will have Mr. Racine look into this particular case, in view of existing legislation. Secondly, I think it is quite proper to say this, but I do not want in any way to prejudice this case, that it is a matter which the Law Officers might review from the standpoint of the possibility of criminal proceedings. I am in no way intimating that anything of that sort is implied, but in view of the publicity and the attention given to this matter, I think it should be reviewed by the Law Officers.

As regards a Royal Commission, we are quite prepared to give consideration to that suggestion. I think it is advisable that we should discuss the matter with the Public Trustee. In the last couple of years, I have had some general conversation with him about this great problem of charities and the use of charities in ways which are certainly not in line with charitable intention. Again, I do not want to pass judgment on this particular matter. From what the Leader of the Opposition has said, and the headlines in the paper here, apparently there are very many undesirable features, if these statements are true.

March 29th, 1951.

B- 7

MR. JOLLIFFE: I tried to be very conservative in anything I said.

MR. FROST: That is right. I would not want to pass hasty judgment on the actions of people. All I can say is that indications here are such that the subject deserves and requires attention. We will see that it receives attention. It may be that, as my hon. friend has said, it would be desirable to have a Royal Commission look into the whole field of Charitable Acts and the operation of such affairs as the ones to which reference has been made. Certainly, I think, the Charities Accounting Act can be strengthened in many ways. I will say that, in my general conversation with Mr. Racine, he is a very able and good Officer, and I suggested that we should not make hasty decisions but that we should profit by experience of the operation and administration of the Act, and form our judgments from the very best information that we can get.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Charities Accounting Act, as is well know, was passed some years ago. I do not think that it has been in active use until very recent days. Apparently, a situation arose some years ago which led to the passing of the Act: then, due to complications in respect of its administration, it was allowed to just ride along. I have a recollection that a former Attorney General, Hon. Mr. Conant, introduced Legislation here to provide that rules be made by the Judges of Osgoode Hall in connection with the administration of the Charities Accounting Act. Personally, I do not think that the operation of that measure has been

good. I think it will be far better that the matter should be brought closer to the Government and rules be made by regulation in the ordinary way and upon the advice of our Officers who are administering these things.

I would not like to comment any more specifically, Mr. Speaker, upon what the hon. member has said. We recognize, of course, that there is here a very great problem, It is one to which we shall give attention; and we shall give full consideration to what our hon. friend has said relative to a Royal Commission after we have had the opportunity of discussing this matter with our Law Officers.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed to-day, as I intimated yesterday, almost immediately with the estimates; but in order that we shall not run into a period where we have no work before the Assembly, it occurred to me that we might get some of the Bills now standing for Second reading into a position where they could be considered in Committee to-morrow. I would like to proceed, therefore, with the second reading of Bills which are, perhaps, non-contentious, to advance them into Committee.

I will call order number twelve.

NIAGARA PARKS ACT

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth order, second reading of Bill No. 141, "An Act to amend The Niagara Parks Act". Mr. Daley.

Hon. D. POINTER: In the absence of hon. Mr. Daley, I move second reading of Bill No. 141.

B-9

MR. W. L. HOUCK: I have something to say on this Bill, but if it is the wish of the Premier, I will withhold it until the Bill goes to Committee. Would that be agreeable to the Premier?

Hon. MR. FROST: Yes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The thirteenth order, second reading of Bill No. 142, "An Act to amend the Registry Act",. Mr. Porter.

Hon. DA'A PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 142.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. MR. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 14.

ALCOHOLISM RESEARCH FOUNDATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The fourteenth order, second reading of Bill No. 143, "An Act to amend the Alcoholism Research Foundation Act". Mr. Phillips.

Hon. DANA PORTER: Mr. Speaker, in the absence
beg to
of Hon. Mr. Phillips, I/move second reading of Bill No. 143.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): In view of the fact that the Minister is absent, I think it should be agreed that if there are any questions relating to principle, they can be raised ---

Hon. MR. PORTER: That is right, ---in Committee.

March 29th, 1951.

B-10

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST(Prime Minister): Order No.15

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The fifteenth order, the second reading of Bill No.144, "An Act to amend The Public Health Act". Mr. Phillips.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Mr. Phillips, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 144.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 16.

BEDS OF NAVIGABLE WATERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The sixteenth order, the second reading of Bill No. 145, "An Act to amend the Beds of Navigable Waters Act". Mr. Scott.

Hon. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands & Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 145.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.17

RURAL TELEPHONE SYSTEMS BILL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The seventeenth order, the second reading of Bill No. 146, "An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems". Mr. Challies.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister Without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 146.

MR. McEWING: Mr. Speaker, I understand it is quite agreeable to the government that we shall defer our discussion until the Bill is in Committee.

March 29th, 1951.

B-11

Hon. MR. FROST: If there is to be any trouble at all, I would, if it were desirable, hold with the second reading. On the other hand, if my hon. friend is in agreement with the general principles, I think the Bill might as well go to Committee; the details can be discussed then.

MR. McEWING: I would like to deal for a while with the Bill on the basis that it might be enlarged somewhat.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We would like to hear you.

Hon. MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, hold the second reading.

Second reading stands.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.18.

THE LAND TRANSFER TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The eighteenth order, second reading of Bill No. 147, "An Act to amend The Land Transfer Tax Act" -- Mr. Frost.

Hon. L. M. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of Bill No. 147.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.19

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The nineteenth order, second reading of Bill No. 148, "An Act to amend Succession Duty Act". Mr. Frost.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 148.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

1. The first of these is the fact that the

29th March

C-1

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 20.

THE PROVINCIAL LOANS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twentieth Order, Second Reading of Bill No. 149, "An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act", Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 149.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 21.

THE HOSPITALS TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-first Order, second reading of Bill No. 150, "An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act", Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 150.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak at length on this Bill, but I do want to suggest to the government that they change the name of this tax. I think it is incorrect and incongruous and misleading to continue to refer to the Amusement Tax as "The Hospitals Tax Act", when the money goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund and is used for whatever purpose the government may decide. It is undoubtedly true that a portion of it does reach the hospitals tax.

MR. FROST: All of it.

MR. SALSBERG: If the government is not limiting its assistance to hospitals by the amount they receive from this tax, they may go beyond it, or they may go below it,

C-2

but it is derived from the fund. That is as it should be. But to continue to call this a "Hospital Tax Act" seems to be almost in the category of calling the Racetrack Tax, a tax for the Aged, or The Liquor Tax, a tax for Mothers' Allowances, and so on, and so on. In other words, you could go ahead and label every tax which is objectionable perhaps to a section of the population, with some appealing title so people will feel that a part of that tax goes to help the poor, or the indigent, or the needy, and so on, and so on. Why not call the Racetrack Tax, a tax for Old-Age pensioners, which I think is just as justified as calling this tax the "Hospital Tax Act". I think we should stop playing around and call this "The Amusement Tax", because that is what it is. It is one of the many taxes which the province imposes, because it requires funds to carry on the various activities of government. That is that.

Everytime I go by the office of the Hospital tax Act in this building, I pause, before I go any further, because I feel there is a very misleading sign on the door. It is not a hospital tax; it is a tax to raise revenue, and is applied for the different purposes of government.

That is all I want to say, and I think the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) feels the same way. Let us re-name it, and call it by some simple, understandable title such as "The Amusement Tax of the Province of Ontario".

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, just briefly in reply, I would point out to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that there would be perhaps some merit to his suggestion, if it were not for the history of this Act. This Act was introduced in 1948, on a vote in the House which was nearly unanimous.

MR. SALSBERG: All but two members.

MR. FROST: There were two dissenters. The purpose was to give the money to hospitals. A hospital fund was set up, and the tax was introduced to provide ways and means for the grants for public ward beds which were made at that time. Last year we abolished that fund, for the reason that we were spending very much more money on hospitals than was being realized from this particular tax. You will recollect last year we reduced the tax from 20% to 15%, and this year it was further reduced to 12½%. Nevertheless, I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that the money is still used for hospitals, and the fear that some people might have expressed at the time that there would be more money received than would be spent on hospitals is now entirely dissipated.

We are spending now \$2 on hospitals for every dollar we receive by way of this tax, so it can be said that this Act, which was introduced for the support of the hospitals, is providing money which is being properly used, but now we are supplementing it by at least one dollar for every dollar raised by this tax.

I think in view of the history of this Act, the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) should leave it the way it is, and when he goes to a show or some entertainment, he can feel very well, because he knows he is contributing to the great hospitals of this province, and that should make him feel better, that if it were called by another name.

MR. MACLEOD: If ever a piece of legislation was conceived in sin, and born in iniquity, it is this.

MR. WALTERS: Mr. Speaker, there is a section of the Act about which I am rather puzzled. May I ask what happens

C-4

to a place where they have no cover charge, but where they have a dining lounge or dining room licence, and have entertainment there?

MR. FROST: I will explain that, Mr. Speaker. I never have enough money myself to go to those places, so I cannot speak from actual experience. I will say, however, that I am quite satisfied my taxing men have not forgotten anything, and I am sure the tax will be forthcoming. I do not think there is any escape from it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 22.

RAISING MONEY ON THE CREDIT OF THE CONSOLIDATED
REVENUE FUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-Second Order, second reading of Bill No. 151, "An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund", Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 151.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

THE HOUSE IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY; MR. PATRICK IN THE CHAIR.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Department of Agriculture, Vote No. 2.

Hon. T.L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman,

29th March 1951

C-5

I have prepared what I have to say in short form, but I would ask the House permission to place a more extended statement on Hansard.

(PAGE C-6 FOLLOWS)

C-6

During the past seven years many changes have taken place in Ontario agriculture and the Department of Agriculture, through its Branches and Institutions has played an important part in bringing these changes about. Following is an outline of policies and projects undertaken by the Department since 1943, broken down according to the Branch or Institution by which the work is being carried out.

ONTARIO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

The past seven years have seen many developments at the College, including the addition of buildings, equipment and staff. Some of the chief developments have been:

1. The creation of two new Departments - (a) Soils and (b) Agricultural Engineering.
2. The establishment of a new two-year course in practical agriculture in 1947.
3. The addition of two new options - (a) Agricultural Economics, including Farm Management.
(b) Agricultural Engineering.
4. The expansion of research facilities and the starting of new projects.

SOURCES OF GRADUATE STUDENTS

<u>Institution of Undergraduate Training</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>No. Students</u>
O.A.C.	Ontario	43
University of Toronto	Ontario	1
McMaster University	Ontario	1
Macdonald College, Quebec	Quebec	2
Laval University	Quebec	1
University of Saskatchewan	Saskatchewan	1
University of Alberta	Alberta	1
Cornell University	New York	1
Durham University	England	1
University of Wageningen	Holland	2
Federal Institute of Technology	Switzerland	1
University of Thessalonique	Greece	1
Hungarian University of Agrarian Sciences	Hungary	1
Czech Technical University	Czechoslovakia	1
University of Agriculture Brno.	Czechoslovakia	1

C-7

5. The appointment of a Director of Research for the Department of Agriculture, stationed at the Ontario Agricultural College. This appointment has made possible even closer collaboration and team work among the research workers of the various Branches and Institutions of the Department, and between these scientists and those of the Dominion Department of Agriculture. The need for this is obvious as there were over 380 separate Research Projects in progress in the Department in 1950.
6. The establishment of a post-graduate school leading to the degree M.S.A. The third calendar for this school will be published this year.
7. The establishment of an Advisory Board.

MACDONALD INSTITUTE

1. This institution was re-opened in the fall of 1946 giving the one-year diploma course.
2. The four-year degree course in Home Economics was instituted, starting in the Fall of 1948.

ONTARIO VETERINARY COLLEGE

Under the guidance of Dr. A. L. MacNabb, who was appointed Principal in 1945, this institution has been raised to a higher status than ever before.

A report from the American Veterinary Medical Association's Council on Education states: "Principal MacNabb is to be commended upon the changes that have occurred in this school during the last few years. From a backward institution with old fashioned ideas, a small staff, poor facilities and little enthusiasm, it is now alive and vibrant. Everyone from the employees to the Minister of Agriculture gives credit to the Principal for these changes and they are supporting him. As we have indicated, there are still things to be done, but we have confidence that they will be done in the near future, and the Ontario Veterinary College will soon take

C-8

its place among our foremost colleges." Some 25 projects having to do with the health of animals have been undertaken or are under way at the Ontario Veterinary College. Some of the more important and newer ones are:

- (a) Research in Bang's disease and Mastitis in cattle.
- (b) Free vaccine for calfhoo vaccination for Bang's Disease has made it possible to campaign against it on a Province-wide basis.
- (c) Research in Rhinitis in Swine.
- (d) Research in Blackhead in Turkeys.
- (e) Blood tests (re parentage).

THE VINELAND EXPERIMENTAL STATION

This Internationally recognized Station has undergone expansion since 1943 and has carried out many important projects.

1. Grape Sub-Station was established in 1946.
2. Horticultural Products Processing Laboratory completed in 1950.
3. Projects: In addition to the work on the Grape Sub-Station the station has undertaken 48 new projects since 1943. A few of the more important are:
 - (a) Quantity and quality of fruit as affected by the stage of maturity at picking time.
 - (b) Experimental shipments of fruit.
 - (c) A Microbiological Study under Mulches and Clean Cultivation.
 - (d) Pollination of tree fruits as affected by the varying insect populations, pollination methods, temperatures, nutritional conditions, varieties and spraying practices.
 - (e) Improvement of varieties of tomatoes for processing.
 - (f) The freezing quality of fruit varieties and seedlings.
 - (g) The canning qualities of fruit varieties and seedlings.

C-9

KEMPTVILLE AGRICULTURAL SCHOOL

In addition to the teaching work carried on at this school, a good deal of experimentation with particular application to Eastern Ontario has been carried out. These have included such things as:

- (a) Testing of Hybrid Corn varieties suitable for grain or for silage in Eastern Ontario.
- (b) Improved the Motor Mechanics and Tractor Course at the school.
- (c) Testing of DDT as an insecticide for potatoes.
- (d) Testing of several materials for late blight control in potatoes.
- (e) Pasture demonstration and experimentation.
- (f) Experiments and demonstrations on haymaking and grass silage.
- (g) Experiments in ventilation of dairy barns.

WESTERN ONTARIO EXPERIMENTAL FARM

1. The building of an Agricultural School at this farm is well under-way and will be opened this October.
2. Projects undertaken include:
 - (a) The erection and establishment of an Agricultural School in connection with the Experimental Farm here.
 - (b) Study of the by-products of cash crops as live stock feed.
 - (c) A study of the herbicides in connection with cash crops.
 - (d) Cultural methods and crop rotation of cash crops in the district.
 - (e) Fertilizers, cultural methods and rotations in the production of early potatoes.

NORTHERN ONTARIO

The assistance program for settlers in Northern Ontario was inaugurated in 1946. Under this policy assistance is given in:

- (a) Clearing Land.
- (b) Breaking Land.
- (c) Drainage.

C-10

- (d) Drilling Wells.
- (e) Transportation of Live Stock.
- (f) Purchase of Potato graders and power sprayers and dusters.
- (g) Establishment of regional veterinarians.

LIVE STOCK BRANCH

1. Staff has been increased as new projects initiated.
2. Projects include:
 - (a) Artificial Insemination Clubs have been organized covering the Province from East to West. The Artificial Insemination Act for 1947 was the first of its kind in Canada.
 - (b) Establishing of co-operating farms re cost of production of hogs and sheep.
 - (c) Establishment of the Beef Bull Sale in 1949.
 - (d) Dairy Herd Improvement Associations started in 1949, now number 44.
 - (e) Feeder Cattle Sales organized on Manitoulin Island and in Algoma District.
 - (f) Assistance given to Warble Fly Control.
 - (g) Advanced Registry Policy for Beef Cattle.
 - (h) Beef-Pasture project.
 - (i) Pig Hatchery project.

FARM ECONOMICS BRANCH

This new branch was organized in 1948 to study costs and efficiency of farm products. Studies have been undertaken either in co-operation with special groups or in co-operation with other branches concerned with projects from which it is possible to obtain data useful for studying costs. Studies undertaken to date, with the number of farmers co-operating in giving data, are listed in table below:

C-11

<u>STUDY</u>	<u>NUMBER OF CO-OPERATORS</u>
Corn for canning	171
Peas for canning	181
Tomatoes for canning	175
Commercial Late Potatoes	70
Hogs	55
Dairy Cattle	150
Dairy Herd Improvement Association Members	775

THE AGRICULTURAL REPRESENTATIVES BRANCH

As the research work of the Department has expanded, Extension Work has also widened its scope in order to translate the results of research and assist the farmers in putting this information into practice. At the same time new policies instituted by other Branches have required additional work on the part of the extension staff. Such are the Dairy Herd Improvement Policy and the Artificial Breeding Program for cattle. As a result additions to the staff have been necessary. There are Assistant Agricultural Representatives in most counties now. In addition, the Fieldmen's Services have been extended as follows:

- (a) Three fruit and vegetable fieldmen are now employed.
- (b) Two farm machinery fieldmen were added to the staff in 1950.

These men work in co-operation with the Agricultural Engineering Department at the Ontario Agricultural College to provide instruction for the Junior Farmer "Farm Equipment Project", the "Boys Tractor Maintenance Club Project", Farm Machinery Short Courses and to give a general advisory service to farmers on Agricultural Engineering problems.

Work with Juniors forms an important part of the activities of this Branch. This takes two forms ... Boys and Girls Club Work and Junior Farmer Work.

C-12

Boys and Girls Club Work developments since 1943 include:

- (a) Addition of two new club projects in 1950 -- Boys Tractor Maintenance Clubs and Farm Forestry Clubs.
- (b) Development of local leaders in Club Work. Conferences for these leaders have been held and trips have been arranged for them in recognition of the leadership they are providing.
- (c) King's Guineas Class at the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair.

JUNIOR FARMER DEVELOPMENTS

- (a) Organization of the Junior Farmers' Association of Ontario in 1944 to co-ordinate all existing groups.
- (b) Promotion of leadership training through camps and Officers' Training Schools.
- (c) Promotion of Educational Projects, e.g. Conferences, Short Courses, Public Speaking Competitions, Provincial Choir Concert and Judging Competitions.
- (d) Promotion of exchange visits for Juniors between Provinces and Internationally.
- (e) Promotion of recreational projects --- e. g. Sports Days and Square Dance Festivals.

The results of this work is showing up in a number of ways. Membership has grown from 3,500 in 1944 when the Provincial Association was organized to more than 11,000 in 1950. Also evidence of the juniors of past years going on to take their place as seniors in the community are to be found in many places. Former Junior Farmers are on the Boards of many Breed Associations and other Provincial and National Farm organizations as well as in county and local organizations and governments.

C-13

One other major project of the Branch is that of Soil Improvement and Land Use, initiated in 1949. Projects carried out in 24 counties with the Agricultural Representative co-operating with local organizations. Programmes include: soil building projects, drainage demonstrations, fertility demonstrations, and educational programmes.

WOMEN'S INSTITUTE BRANCH

Through this Branch the work of the local Institutes and the Provincial organization is given assistance and guidance. This is done through providing speakers, arranging conferences and giving instruction in various phases of homemaking. At the same time the Branch is responsible for the development of club work and the Junior Institutes which are affiliated with the Junior Farmers of Ontario.

THE FRUIT BRANCH

Major projects of this Branch instituted in the last seven years are:

- (a) The fruit and vegetable inspection service has been very greatly expanded during the office of the present government. Formerly inspection work was carried on by the Dominion Department but more and more this work is now being handled by the Province.
- (b) Four highway inspection stations have been constructed and are operated during the season of the year when harvesting is in progress.
- (c) An apple orchard census was taken in the interests of the industry to reveal information pertaining to marketing, cultural trends, etc.
- (d) Annual acreage surveys are now made of the marsh areas at Thedford and Bradford and in certain highland areas.
- (e) Improved methods of grading peas grown for processing has been studied and it may lead to government men doing the

C-14

grading of all peas purchased for processing.

- (f) Tomato grading has been introduced in Ontario. All tomatoes purchased for processing are now purchased on grades determined by government men.

The Co-operative Marketing Loan Act is also administered by this Branch. The Act was passed in 1932. A list of the number and amount of the loans annually since that time follows:

LOANS MADE UNDER THE CO-OPERATIVE
MARKETING LOAN ACT

<u>Years</u>	<u>Number of Loans</u>	<u>Total amount of Loans Made</u>
1931-32	8	\$ 130,800.00
1933	9	102,000.00
1934	1	25,000.00
1935	3	63,400.00
1936	1	2,500.00
1937	1	9,000.00
1938	1	5,000.00
1939	3	57,500.00
1940	2	17,000.00
1941	1	5,000.00
1942	1	<u>5,000.00</u>
		\$ 402,200.00
1943	1	5,000.00
1944	11	249,000.00
1945	14	295,000.00
1946	11	114,000.00
1947	4	41,000.00
1948	12	283,000.00
1949	11	178,000.00
1950	5	<u>170,000.00</u>
		\$1,270,400.00
		\$1,672,600.00

C-15

CROPS, SEEDS AND WEEDS BRANCH

1. Crop Objectives: These were first established in 1944 with the Provincial objective of 200 million bushels of grain. Production was gradually encouraged until this objective was finally achieved in 1950. The 1951 objective has been set at 250 million bushels.
2. Hay and Pasture Demonstrations: Begun in 1944 - 2,295 demonstration hay and pasture plots of 3 to 5 acres each have been laid down on 712 farms in every county and district of the Province.
3. Field Days: To demonstrate crop work, drainage, the growing and preservation of fodder and pasture, and conservation field days have been held on these various subjects. The first was the Grassland Day in Oxford County in 1947.
4. Under the new Weed Control Act the efficiency of the weed inspectors has been increased and the cost of administration decreased.
5. High Yield Clubs: These are organized under the Crop Improvement Associations and have served to focus attention on cultural practices which result in better yields.
6. Beef Pasture Improvement Project: A joint project with the Live Stock Branch, begun in 1950 to determine the best methods of increasing the carrying capacity of pastures in order to produce more beef.
7. Bacterial Ring Rot Inspection: At the request of producers the legislation covering this disease was instituted. The inspection has made it possible to keep this dangerous potato disease under control.
8. While this organization came into being in 1938, its scope and activity has broadened greatly since 1943. During the past seven years the Seed Growers Section has been added and

C-16

13 new committees have been established. In 1950, 411 demonstration projects were carried on by the 56 branches.

AGRICULTURAL AND HORTICULTURAL SOCIETIES

1. This Branch administers the Community Centres Act of 1949.

Under it, grants have been paid on projects as follows:

57 Community Halls.

54 Athletic Fields.

69 Skating Arenas.

12 Outdoor Skating Rinks.

29 Combined Arenas and Halls.

2. Commercial Production Features at Fairs: Special grants are given to encourage these exhibits of commercial producers of crops which are important in the area covered by any particular Fair.
3. District Plowing Matches: Grants for such matches given where four or more local matches combine to hold a district match.
4. Horticultural Projects: (Sponsored through the Ontario Horticultural Association)
 - (a) School Forestry Competitions initiated in 1945.
 - (b) Wild Flower Essay Competition initiated in 1947.
 - (c) Food Parcels to Britain.
 - (d) Maple Seedlings provided to the Imperial War Graves Commission for planting in cemeteries in Britain and on the continent containing graves of Canadian War Dead.

DISTRIBUTION OF FORAGE SEEDS

INCLUDING GRASSES AND CLOVERS

The Ontario Department of Agriculture distributed new and improved strains of forage crops from the seed farm for the first time in 1948, the amount being 500 lbs. The amount of seed which will be distributed during the year 1951 is approximately 6,500 lbs.

C-17

In the year 1950, some 96 farmers grew this seed, these farmers being located in 32 counties and districts in the province.

DAIRY BRANCH

The chief work of this Branch is concerned with the Administration of the Dairy Products Act. This includes inspection of creameries and cheese factories, milk and cream testing, grading of milk and cream, instruction of producers in improvement of milk and cream on the farm, and quality improvement of dairy products generally.

Creamery and cheese factory competitions organized through the co-operation of the Dairy Branch, the factory operators and the producers has resulted in considerable improvement in the quality of cream and milk and of the processed products. This is indicated by the fact that in 1943 8.9% of the cream sold was second grade and by 1950 this had been reduced to 4.5%. During the same period the percentage of first grade butter produced in Ontario was raised from 61% to 88%.

Further encouragement to the improvement of cream quality was provided in the amendments to the regulations allowing the payment of more than one cent premium for special grade cream.

Preliminary work on the sediment testing of milk was begun in 1944. Sufficient progress has been made that in 1950 legislation was passed to provide for the grading of milk by flavour and sediment test at all plants.

Work was started in 1943 on testing for extraneous matter in cheese. Considerable improvement has been made in this direction and this has opened the American market to Ontario cheese.

Encouragement has been given to cheese factories to amalgamate in order to improve their set-up and equipment and make possible the establishment of better and more efficient production units. This change has taken place steadily. For example, in 1946-47, 15 amalgamations

C-18

replaced 32 smaller plants in Eastern Ontario.

The storage and marketing of cheese has also been given attention and in 1950 a grant to the Ontario Cheese Producers Association assisted them in the building of a large cheese storage at Belleville which is now nearing completion.

MARKETS BRANCH

1. This Branch administers the Farm Products Marketing Act as changed in 1946. There are now 16 Marketing Schemes covering 25 commodities operating under this legislation. The schemes in operation, the commodities covered and the year they were approved are as follows:

- (1) Asparagus Growers Marketing Scheme (1937).
- (2) Ontario Cheese Producers Marketing Scheme (1937).
- (3) Ontario Peach Growers Marketing Scheme (1937).
- (4) Ontario Pear, Plum and Cherry Growers Marketing Scheme (1938).
- (5) Ontario Seed Corn Growers Marketing Scheme (1942).
- (6) Ontario Sugar Beet Growers Marketing Scheme (1942).
- (7) Ontario Berry Growers Marketing Scheme (1944). This scheme combined raspberries with the strawberry Marketing Scheme established in 1938.
- (8) Ontario Bean Growers Marketing Scheme (1944) for white and yellow-eye dry beans.
- (9) Ontario Hog Producers Marketing Scheme (1946).
- (10) Ontario Cream Producers Marketing Scheme (1947).
- (11) Ontario Vegetable Growers Marketing Scheme (1947).

This Scheme amalgamated the Tomato Growers Marketing Scheme of 1938 and the Green Pea and Sweet Corn Growers Marketing Scheme of 1945. In 1948 green and wax beans were added to the Scheme and in 1949

March 29th, 1951.

C-19

cabbage,,carrots and beets were added.

- (12) Ontario Grape Growers Marketing Scheme (1947).
- (13) Southwestern Ontario New Potato Growers Marketing Scheme (1948).
- (14) Ontario Soybean Growers Marketing Scheme (1948).
- (15) Ontario Winter Celery Growers Marketing Scheme (1949).
- (16) Southern Ontario Honey Producers Marketing Scheme, (1950).

2, The other major project of the Branch has to do with the Ontario Food Terminal. The Farmers Market Section of the Terminal will come into operation in May of this year.

STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON ONTARIO AGRICULTURE
AGGREGATE VALUE OF TOTAL FARM PRODUCTION IN ONTARIO

	Year 1949 Value of Total Production \$	Year 1950 Value of Total Production \$
Wheat.....	44,592,000	51,612,000
Oats.....	56,134,000	76,949,000
Barley.....	8,082,000	10,823,000
Rye.....	2,960,000	2,598,000
Dry Beans.....	5,239,000	4,614,000
Dry Peas.....	966,000	849,000
Soy Beans.....	5,887,000	7,598,000
Buckwheat.....	1,766,000	1,706,000
Mixed Grains.....	39,328,000	52,716,000
Flaxseed,,,,,,,,,,,,	647,000	791,000
Shelled Corn.....	16,244,000	22,863,000
Potatoes.....	21,341,000	17,574,000
Turnips, mangels.....	8,160,000	8,027,000

March 29th, 1951.

C-20

Alfalfa, Hay and Clover.....	103,720,000	113,493,000
Fodder Corn.....	24,244,000	23,846,000
Sugar Beets.....	4,630,000	5,445,000
TOTAL ABOVE FIELD CROPS.....	343,940,000	401,504,000
Clover and Grass Seed.....	2,372,000	2,000,000
Tobacco.....	55,592,000	48,705,000
Fibre Flax.....	263,000	250,000
Fruit.....	19,056,000	21,000,000
Vegetables.....	36,487,000	32,500,000
Greenhouse Products..... and Floriculture	3,686,000	3,400,000
Cattle and Calves.....	139,573,000	160,000,000
Sheep and Lambs.....	4,039,000	3,500,000
Hogs.....	165,690,000	165,000,000
Horses (Change in Inventory.....	-2,150,000	-2,000,000
Poultry and Eggs.....	97,203,000	93,000,000
Butter.....	41,676,000	36,007,000
Cheese.....	22,686,000	17,136,000
Milk and Other Milk Products.....	85,186,000	86,500,000
Wool.....	590,000	650,000
Honey.....	2,004,000	1,758,000
Maple Products.....	1,003,000	1,900,000
Fur Farming.....	1,973,000	1,620,000
Forest Products.....	30,187,000	30,000,000
GRAND TOTAL:.....	1,051,806,000	1,104,430,000.

NOTE:- The figures for 1950 are a preliminary estimate and subject to later revision.

INCREASE IN FARM PRICES OF SOME PRODUCTS
to 1950

Comparing farm prices in the year 1940 with those of 1950 we find that in the Province of Ontario the following changes took place:

Strawberries	increased by	228.1%
Raspberries	" "	254.2%
Hogs	" "	243.8%
Beef Cattle	" "	267.9%
Milk Cows	" "	226.7%
Calves	" "	213.9%
Burley Tobacco	" "	145.9%
Butter Fat	" "	120.6%
Cheese Milk	" "	124.5%
Wheat	" "	150.9%
Honey	" "	98.0%
Barley	" "	163.1%
Eggs	" "	71.4%
Oats	" "	140.6%
(Fluid Milk)	" "	
(Toronto Milk Shed)		95.4%
Tomatoes	" "	103.7%
Apples	" "	107.4%
Plums	" "	37.1%

MILK PRODUCTION IN ONTARIO COMPARED WITH SOME COUNTRIES
(Annual production in gallons per capita)

X

Ontario.....	125	gallons
United Kingdom.....	33	"
United States	77	"

March 29th, 1951.

C- 22

EGG PRODUCTION IN ONTARIO COMPARED WITH SOME COUNTRIES X
(Annual production per capita)

Ontario	395 eggs
Canada	338 "
United Kingdom	94 "
United States.....	381 "
Netherlands	118 "
Denmark.....	329 "

PIGS SLAUGHTERED IN ONTARIO COMPARED WITH SOME COUNTRIES X
(Number slaughtered per thousand persons)

Ontario	676 Head
Canada	577 "
United Kingdom.....	39 "
United States.....	487 "
Netherlands.....	104 "
Denmark.....	472 "

X - Based on figures recently released by the Commonwealth
Economic Committee.

EXPORTS OF HOLSTEIN BREEDING STOCK, 1950

Total exports of Holstein Breeding Stock, 1950---17,197
Exports to Continental U.S.A. (30 States----- 16,543
To Countries outside Continental U.S.A.----- 654

Countries outside Continental U.S.A. to which cattle were
shipped:

Ecuador, Cuba, Colombia, Porto Rico, Central America,
Bermuda, Bahamas, Uruguay, Guatemala, Brazil and Mexico.

March 29th, 1951

C-23

EXPORT OF HOLSTEIN BREEDING STOCK

1 9 5 0

To give some comparison, Great Britain has always been the home of the Shorthorn cattle and has always exported them to other countries for foundation stock. In 1950, the total export of Shorthorns from Great Britain was 504, shipped to 13 different countries.

A single cattleman in Peel County of our province shipped 528 head of dairy breeding stock in one year to thirteen countries.

Total exports of Holstein Breeding Stock, 1950
(from Canada)17,197

75% of these cattle were exported from Ontario

32% of the Holstein cattle registered in the equivalent of numbers were exported from this province in 1950.

Exports to Continental U.S.A.(30 States....16,543

To Countries outside Continental U.S.A..... 654

Ecuador

Cuba

Colombia

Porto Rico

Central America

Bermuda

Bahamas

Uruguay

Guatemala

Brazil

Mexico

The history of Ontario Agriculture over the past seven years has been one of increased and improved production. As a result of scientific developments and better farming our farmers have been producing much more grain per acre, grazing more cattle per acre and have put up more hay with a higher protein content per acre than ever. This increase in production has made it possible to feed a greater number of livestock and poultry.

At the same time, the production per acre of potatoes has been increasing and the output of fruits and vegetables has been at a very high level.

In Gulliver's Travels, Jonathan Swift said:

"And he gave it as his opinion that whoever could make two ears of corn or two blades of grass, to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before, would deserve better of mankind and do more essential service to his country than the whole race of politicians put together."

Our Ontario farmers have been doing just this. They have been making two blades of grass grow where only one grew before and have been producing two ears of corn where only one grew before. At the same time they have been paying attention to the quality of those blades of grass and ears of corn with the result that both quantity and quality of food produced has been improved. They have been and are growing two better blades of grass where only one grew before.

C-25

Average Annual Prices Received by Ontario Farmers

	Year 1919	Year 1929	Year 1939	Year 1949	Year 1950	Feb.15 1951
Fall Wheat ¢ per bus.	237.2	124.0	64.0	177.0	165.0	177.2
Spring Wheat .. ¢ per bus.	240.9	125.2	66.0	177.0	165.0	
Oats ¢ per bus.	97.7	62.4	34.0	84.0	82.0	92.1
Barley ¢ per bus.	145.8	76.5	46.0	125.0	124.0	132.0
Peas, dry ¢ per bus.	263.9	163.0	177.0	247.0	300.0	
Beans, dry ¢ per bus.	4.00	3.03	2.25	3.32	4.80	
Rye ¢ per bus.	159.1	97.1	58.0	133.0	140.0	145.2
Buckwheat ¢ per bus.	140.7	83.2	52.0	121.0	119.0	
Corn (shelled). ¢ per bus.	162.3	100.2	55.0	130.0	155.0	
Hay and Clover. \$ per ton	22.68	11.28	7.61	21.15	18.00	
Potatoes ¢ per cwt.	275.3	180.0	113.4	224.0	192.0	

Average Price of Live Stock per 100 Pounds at Toronto

	Year 1919	Year 1929	Year 1939	Week Ending March 8, 1951
Steers, good .. \$ per cwt.	13.06	10.16	6.89	32.25
Hogs, dressed . \$ per cwt.	26.11	16.50	11.88	34.48
Sheep, good ... \$ per cwt.	10.37	6.52	4.49	21.00
Lambs, good ... \$ per cwt.			9.47	34.00

Table 1

Table 1. Summary of the data for the first group of experiments.

Run	Time	Temp	Pressure	Flow	Notes
1	10.0	20.0	1.0	1.0	First run, standard conditions.
2	10.5	20.5	1.0	1.0	Second run, standard conditions.
3	11.0	21.0	1.0	1.0	Third run, standard conditions.
4	11.5	21.5	1.0	1.0	Fourth run, standard conditions.
5	12.0	22.0	1.0	1.0	Fifth run, standard conditions.
6	12.5	22.5	1.0	1.0	Sixth run, standard conditions.
7	13.0	23.0	1.0	1.0	Seventh run, standard conditions.
8	13.5	23.5	1.0	1.0	Eighth run, standard conditions.
9	14.0	24.0	1.0	1.0	Ninth run, standard conditions.
10	14.5	24.5	1.0	1.0	Tenth run, standard conditions.

Table 2. Summary of the data for the second group of experiments.

Run	Time	Temp	Pressure	Flow	Notes
11	15.0	25.0	1.0	1.0	Eleventh run, standard conditions.
12	15.5	25.5	1.0	1.0	Twelfth run, standard conditions.
13	16.0	26.0	1.0	1.0	Thirteenth run, standard conditions.
14	16.5	26.5	1.0	1.0	Fourteenth run, standard conditions.

Take "C"

March 29, 1951

C-26

Dealer's Buying Prices, Delivered At Toronto

	<u>March 1 1919</u>	<u>March 1 1929</u>	<u>March 1 1939</u>	<u>March 1 1951</u>	<u>March 15 1951</u>
Creamery Butter ¢ per lb.	49 - 50	42 - 42½	22	71½ - 73	82 - 83
Eggs, top grade ¢ per doz.	41 - 42	42 - 43	20½	52 -	51 - 52

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

D-1

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, on Vote 1, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) if there is a service branch responsible for preventing the outbreak of disease? I presume the province of Ontario does some checking in regard to nursery stock brought into this province, or is that dominion?

MR. KENNEDY: Dominion, purely.

MR. DENNISON: Let me point out a danger. I think it was mentioned by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) the city of Toronto are bringing in Dutch maple trees for University Avenue. In view of the fact that the Dutch elm disease is such a dangerous thing in the United States, and probably will wipe out the elm trees in our generation, I wonder if the Department should not interest itself in that matter a little bit.

MR. KENNEDY: We have some people working with Ottawa, sending them down to Eastern Ontario, where that elm disease is, every summer. We have kept it in check so far.

MR. ISLEY: I wonder if the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) could explain an item under special educational campaigns.

MR. KENNEDY: What Vote?

MR. ISLEY: Vote 1, Item 4. What do you accomplish in that special educational campaign?

MR. KENNEDY: We advertise in all the farm journals. It costs \$8,000. We have teachers, involving quite an expense, going out to different schools.

D-2

We have the Ontario Research Foundation. We pay for that. We also pay for the pamphlets we get out in respect of that. Those pamphlets cost about twice as much as ever before. Most come from Guelph, as you know.

MISS MacPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, my regard for the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is well known, but, in this case, I think he lost track, having regard to the statement of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) with respect to per capita. Take Denmark, Belgium and Holland, little countries like one of our counties, with crowded populations; they could not possibly grow as much per capita. I know the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) is an honest man. What does he have to say about that?

MR. KENNEDY: I said "For every man, woman and child", whereas I should have said, "Per one thousand." We have always heard that every farmer in Denmark has a lot of pigs, pigs all over; the same as Holland and England. The fact of the matter is, they may have a few pigs; while one of our farmers may have several hundred or thousand pigs. Per capita, we are producing more than any country of which I know.

MR. ELLIS: On Vote 4, I would like to point out that there were wires received yesterday in the House, by, I believe, every hon. member, and sent by the Ontario Elevators Association. I do not know whether I am being honoured or discredited by this, but I believe I am being honoured. Apparently the statement I made was in respect to the Marketing Act. I said that

D-3

in my opinion the farmers should have the right to pool under our present Marketing Act. I believe that is what they are complaining against.

I would ask of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), I believe that he has some very definite ideas on pooling, what is his attitude in respect of pooling provided for under the present Marketing Act?

MR. KENNEDY: We will have the Marketing Act Bill in to-morrow; probably Monday.

MR. ELLIS: Is the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) in favour of pooling?

MR. KENNEDY: I think I told you about my co-operative movements while I was Minister. I cannot see anything else. I am all for the farmers looking after their own business the best way they can do it.

MR. FOSTER: Is the Farm Products Marketing Act coming in as a bill before it goes to the Committee on Agriculture? Will we have an opportunity of discussing it before it goes to the Committee?

MR. KENNEDY: Definitely.

MR. ISLEY: Under Vote 1 I see there is a new item, Rural Telephone Board, \$100,000. I wonder if the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) could give us an explanation on that item.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Did I not give the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) a full explanation of that yesterday?

MR. ISLEY: I was not here.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I will get the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) a copy of Hansard and send it over to him.

MR. WISMER: On that item, I think it says the bill provides for it.

MR. FROST: No. This \$100,000 is set aside by the O.T.A.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It does not say O.T.A. here.

Vote No.1 agreed to.

On Vote 2.

MR. McEWING: With respect to the grant to the agricultural and horticultural societies, is it increased all along the line, or is it special?

MR. KENNEDY: An increase along the line.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Does the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) care to make any report about grants under the Community Centres Act? I will not pursue it, if the figures are not here.

MR. KENNEDY: I think I have them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it would be interesting to know how many community centres you have had during the last two years.

MR. KENNEDY: Grants were paid on 69 Skating Arenas, 58 Community Halls, 48 Athletic Fields and 12 Out-door Rinks.

(Take E follows.)

E-1

MR. McEWING: Pretty close to your guess.

MR. GRUMMETT: Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) tell us how many hundred-year-old agricultural societies there are in Ontario?

MR. KENNEDY: Not this year.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Returning to this rural telephone Board, I wonder if we could have an explanation of what is the difference between the money which can be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue fund on a vote of the Legislature which is not statutory, a vote which proceeds out of the powers granted by the Act, which would be statutory. Under section 3, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is the body who will authorize monies to be spent.

Referring to item 9 of the vote, I think there is some discrepancy here.

MR. KENNEDY: If you look in the public accounts, you will see the difference. Where someone is appointed and wants to enforce the Act, it is always done by Order-in-Council. But sometimes you have to spend money fast. For instance, you may have to weed out ragweed in northern Ontario. I had to send up some machines there to get it under control. The minister has to do things like that sometimes. If you look here you will see exactly how I spend this money.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Was this done by warrant?

MR. KENNEDY: No, I have a vote, but some of these funds are by authority of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. WISMER: The Hydro is putting in a telephone system. Why is it charged to the Department of Agriculture?

MR. FROST: Because Hydro is not in the estimates here

March 29, 1951.

E-2

by any monies paid, by hydro is paid through the department.

MR. KENNEDY: And they want the next hon. minister to look after that.

Vote agreed to.

Vote 3: Agricultural Representative Branch.

MR. BAXTER: Under Vote 3, agricultural branch. In looking over the public accounts for 1949-50, I note that the agricultural representatives in my part of the country are receiving approximately \$2,739. each. I was just wondering if there has been any increase in recent years in the salaries of these officials. I do not see any reference this year to a possible bonus. In our agricultural representatives we have some of the finest people that can be found in the province of Ontario; and with the calls made upon them by so many important organizations, junior farmers and junior institutes and the rest, I do not how these men have any home life at all. They are out all hours of the day and all hours of the night. I only hope that provision is being made that their salaries shall be commensurate with the increased cost of living.

MR. KENNEDY: There is an increase, and also an increase in their numbers, depending how fast we can get graduates from the college.

MR. BAXTER: I am told that the salaries are not sufficient to induce these boys when they leave college to go into the agricultural representative branch. These men are asked to do some fantastic jobs; they are out night and day; and it is only the man who has a love for the soil who would think of taking on the job. I know agricultural representatives and I was recently at a dinner for our good representative for the county of Waterloo. I do not think these men are being paid the amount of money they should receive for the number

E-3

of hours they are expected to work and the various organizations they are required to serve. Is it not true that we would have more men in the field if the salary were attractive?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. We shall have to make the salaries larger to attract the men we want.

MR. McEWING: Have not the public been demanding of these men too many services which are outside their own field?

MR. KENNEDY: We are trying to stop that.

MR. McEWING: I know what one agricultural representative is doing beyond his agricultural work, in connection with service clubs and the Red Cross.

MR. KENNEDY: We are trying to stop that kind of thing.

MR. McEWING: It seems to me that to a large extent that could be cut out. There is a big field in purely agricultural work.

MR. JOLLIFFE: To follow up what the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) said, it seems to me it is very difficult to cut that out unless the **agricultural representative** branch takes a very firm line there. The position is this, as I see it. The agricultural representatives live and work among their own people. They are something like unfortunate rural ministers; if they are asked to do something, it is difficult to say "No", and it is even more difficult to draw the line between those to whom one is going to say "No" and those to whom one is to say "Yes".

MR. FROST: How about the Parliament?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Of course, they are bears for punishment; but they have to say "No" occasionally and take their chances. But I do not see how the representatives can be rescued from the predicament they are now in unless there are

March 29, 1951.

E-4

orders in the question from "on high". The hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) touched on the matter rather lightly. The fact is that some of these representatives are secretaries, office boys and messengers, for an incredible number of organizations; they are being asked to a whole lot of things they should not be asked to do and which the poor devils find it difficult to refuse, because influential people in the county want them to do these things. It seems to me that in this day and age, when many of our young farmers have a high school education, or hold a diploma from Guelph, and when many of them are ⁱⁿ these junior farmers organizations, some of the secretarial duties of local organizations could be taken over by these young people. A lot of these young people have had a good education.

MR. KENNEDY: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Unfortunately the condition has grown up that the work should be loaded on the agricultural representative. He has an office and a typewriter, so it is ~~put~~ upon him. I do not think that is good enough. I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) that his director of extension will have to cut down on this practice. My observation of the representatives is that most of them like the work. They would not stay in it if they did not; they will certainly not make a fortune out of it. But what is to them the least attractive phase of their work, and the part which is driving many of them to exhaustion, is the amount of detailed duties of the kind I have mentioned which they have been loaded with. It is not fair to them, and it means that they will not be able to give the service it was intended they should give to our farmers, technically, and in the matter

of leadership.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Just before the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy), may I say that surely the classical example of overworked representatives is 'Tommy' Cooper in Grey. I used to live in Grey, and I know a lot about his activities. He does not work hard; he runs hard. It is a wonder that he did not break his neck years ago, considering the way he drives. I would not risk taking a drive with him -- ; I would rather walk, -- it is safer. It is a shame, the amount of things he has to do. He is secretary of everything in the county of Grey. It may be there exceptions, but I do not happen to know of any.

MR. OLIVER: Before the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) replies to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe), would he tell the House what increases have taken place in the past two or three years in the salaries of the representatives. I mean, what is the average percentage of increases?

MR. KENNEDY: 50 per cent, \$1600. a year. Three years ago the maximum was \$3,000.; now these men are paid \$4,600. All along the line there have been quite substantial increases. I agree that our representatives love their work. I had a drive with Tom Cooper around those hills. I wanted to stop, get out and walk, but I could not slow him down. I suggested that I would like another car and another driver. He said, "You will have to take it just the same way as some of our assistants take it when they are out with us". He named several men, one of whom is was an hon. member. We have already put a stop to some of these additional activities.

March 29, 1951

E-6

MISS MACPHAIL: "Tommy" is getting old.

MR. KENNEDY: I hope through this junior farmer work we shall get some young boys to take on these secretarial duties. It is training for them; they should do it whenever possible.

MR. OLIVER: In connection with item 7 of vote 3, would the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) tell the House what has been done with the \$50,000. "Grants and Expenses in Connection with Soil Improvement and Land Use Projects". What is the pattern followed by the Department in connection with the expenditure of that money?

MR. KENNEDY: We pay 50 per cent of the county council expenditures, and I think that work has been undertaken in the counties of Peterboro, Carlton, Essex, Leeds, Grenville, Grey, Haldimand, Halton, Kent, Leeds, Lennox Addington, Prince Edward, Simcoe, Stormont, Waterloo and Wentworth and other counties; for 1950, Brant and Lambton.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is this the item to which the Department assists in the New Hamburg demonstration?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is this item?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) say if any similar projects ^{are} contemplated for the future?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. We can make no general policy that will apply to all the province of Ontario, so we say to the county committees in each county, get the farmers together and decide upon some project which you

think will aid in conservation in the county, and we will match the county contribution, -- \$2,000. to your \$2,000., for as many years as you want to go on with that project."

It has to comply with what we think is right, but as yet we have never refused any application.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is there that is comparable to the New Hamburg demonstration?

MR. KENNEDY: None exactly like that. Each county is a little different. Peterboro has plowing and forestry; other counties have other projects. Each county adopts what it thinks is most important for itself. Kent wants soil improvement. They say that their need is for grasses to go right down into the ground. The Dominion government has an experimental farm in their district which operates in conjunction with them and with ourselves, and work is being done on grasses to put fertility back into the soil.

MR. ISLEY: I notice that the grant is for \$ 2,000. That has been the same sum for three years. If there is a demand for more of these projects, I assume that more money will be included in your estimates.

MR. KENNEDY: That is right.

MR. ISLEY: Then I presume there is no further demand for this type of industry?

MR. KENNEDY: It is going ahead. This spring we are to have a general meeting of all counties to go over the work done by all the counties, and we want those that are not in the scheme to come around with some project. So we are having a general meeting, to be attended by leading farmers of the county.

MR. ISLEY: I think that is a splendid idea. I would like to say that I think these projects are of great educational value to the people in the district, and

March 29, 1951.

E-8

that there should be more of them, because they provide an example so the farmer can go and take a look for himself. Probably he could not read about it and keep it in mind, but when he goes out and sees one of these projects he realizes what is being done. I know that in our county there are a lot of people who think we should have farm projects, not just along the lines of soil conservation but in other directions; for instance, farm ponds are talked about a good deal today. I believe that farm ponds are another way of conserving water. There should be somewhere in each county a pond constructed and publicized so that people would go and see it; and if there is literature available as to the cost of that project I think there would be more ponds in the county.

MR. McEWING: If the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) lacks any suggestions, all he needs to do is to look up the Conservation Committee's report. There is certainly a great field there indicated in that report; and I suggest that if as much is to be purchased in connection with these projects as was bought last year, necessarily the vote will have to be increased.

MR. KENNEDY: I think it is reasonable certain that Ottawa will give us grants this year for farm ponds. They have a bill ready for that purpose, and I believe it will be presented this year, and that it will be along the same lines as those which have been followed in the three prairie provinces of the west. If the Bill is passed, we shall meet our proportion of the expense and encourage this work in every way possible. I fully agree with what the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) says; he is quite right.

March 29, 1951.

E-9

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am glad to hear the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) say that, because for some time some of us have felt that it is somewhat anomalous that the prairie provinces should receive what they have received -- much as they needed it, and the Maritime provinces to receive what they have been getting, while Ontario has received nothing of the kind. I hope the hon. Minister 's (Mr. Kennedy) prediction is right and that parliament will take action on these lines, because it is long overdue. Probably we could persuade the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) to agree with us, about that.

MR. KENNEDY: I am informed by the highest authorities that that is coming.

MR. McEWING: Should you not increase the amount?

MR. KENNEDY: No. I think that, with assistance, from Ottawa, it will be adequate.

MR. FOSTER: I should like to revert to item 5 of vote 3, "County Agricultural Committees, Travelling and Other Expenses". Last year \$10,000. was included in the estimates for this purpose. This year the amount is down to \$9,000. As one who is interested in the forming of these county committees originally, I should like to ask if they are passing out of the picture in the province of Ontario, or how many are expected to be in operation.

MR. KENNEDY: Soon after we passed legislation, the federation took the matter up and formed county committees. I agree that they should do the work without government assistance, and we are encouraging them to proceed without government assistance. That is the reason the amount has been cut down. I think it is right that

E-10

they should be an independent body.

MR. NIXON: This was just Mr. Drew's cockeyed scheme, anyway. So you might as well forget it.

MR. KENNEDY: Don't you pick on me.

MR. NIXON: We won't blame you for that one.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

On Vote 4.

MR. MacLEOD: On Vote 4, Mr. Chairman, I think this might be the appropriate item with respect to which to direct a question to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy). In early November there was an announcement in one of the evening papers, I think it was the Toronto Daily Star, dealing with the surplus crop in the Holland Marsh. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is quoted as saying that there were 265,000 bags of onions out in the open on the Marsh at that time. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is also quoted as saying that they were selling those onions at a dollar for three bags when it cost the growers \$1.50 per bag to produce them. Then the item goes on to say, quoting the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy):

"On account of the heavy rains, crops
were almost doubled in potatoes, carrots
and other vegetables all over the province."

At that time, apparently the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) undertook to do two things. First, to try and find storage space for the 265,000 bags of onions, and secondly, to try and find a market for them in the West Indies or in some of the Caribbean countries. I think we would all be interested to learn what happened to those onions; whether the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) was able to find storage space for them, and, more particularly, whether the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) was able to find a market for them.

F-2

MR. KENNEDY: We stored them out at the Toronto Exhibition Grounds. If you come in any morning, you will see them there. We supplied the space for them, but they had to put them in and look after them and sell them. We had nothing to do with that. Then we loaned them some money under our Co-Operative Marketing Act so that they could dehydrate a great number of onions. If they had guessed right, it might have been all right, but unfortunately the Egyptian onions come in much cheaper because of low Egyptian labour. They did not get a market for all of the onions. While heavy rains made heavy crops, it also brought disease amongst the crops. Some of those we thought we could not sell have been scarce because they went bad in the field from too much rain.

MR. MacLEOD: Would it not have been a good idea for the Department of the Government to have compensated the farmers by making the surplus onions available to institutions, for instance?

MR. KENNEDY: There is a bill in Ottawa which provides for that. They have \$200,000,000 down at Ottawa to cover that.

MR. MacLEOD: Instead of having those onions lying down at the Exhibition Grounds where they may finally rot away, would it not be a good idea to provide all the institutions, the hospitals, the homes for the aged and so on, with onions out of that surplus? Why let them rot?

MR. DENT: I suggested that he send them down

F-3

to Mitch Hepburn. He would market them all right.

MR. MacLEOD: Do you think we should permit 265,000 bags of onions to rot?

MR. DENT: I think it is disgraceful.

MR. MacLEOD: What do you think we should do about it?

MR. DENT: I am quite sure the Hon. Minister did all he could to help these people market their onions. I think anyone who grows onions without a market is doing it at his own risk -- just like you go to the races, bet on the wrong horse, lose and you are out of luck. That is the way I feel about the onion growers -- if they had been willing to work 365 days of the year and milk cows they would have had some revenue.

MR. DENNISON: On Item 4, I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to a certain situation which prevails in connection with the item whereby we spend \$17,500 to promote the organization among farmers of marketing methods and so on.

There seems to be in the province of Ontario a great attack at the present time upon all these organizations of the farmer in attempting to market their own produce. I do not know why that should be and I do not know who is behind it, but I am sure every hon. member of this House must have received some of these new publications which are appearing on the surface at the present time. I do not know whether these are the fore-runners of an election, or whether they are the fore-runners of a hatchet job

on the opposition in the election. I do not know whether Gladstone Murray has been replaced by someone else but I am sure all the hon. members of the House must get this little publication published up in the north-west. It is called the "Rural Scene".

MR. MacLEOD: That fellow used to be a C.C.F-er.

MR. DENNISON: John Atkins, Publisher. I never heard of him in the C.C.F. E. J. Young, Editor. This publication seems to be, week after week, attacking the farm marketing schemes, trying to frighten farmers against the danger of marketing their own products, and retaining some control over their own products. In the last issue of this publication, it was said:

"A demand is being created for legislation that will take the marketing of crops completely out of the farmers' hands and put it into the hands of government-appointed boards which will have a monopolistic control of whatever crops are assigned to them."

MR. DUNBAR: Would you not be in favour of that?

MR. DENNISON: I certainly would not.

MR. DUNBAR: Is that not your policy?

MR. DENNISON: This is attacking you, Mr.

Minister (Mr. Kennedy). Further on, it is said:

"The farmers will have no authority over the boards but the boards will have complete control over the farmers."

MR. KENNEDY: Do you believe that?

MR. DENNISON: No, I do not believe this. I think this is the rankest form of propaganda, false

F-5

propaganda this province has at the present time. I am wondering who is publishing this thing.

MR. McEWING: Who is reading it?

MR. DENNISON: I am wondering who is putting the funds up.

MR. MacLEOD: Who do you think?

MR. DENNISON: There must be some branch of big business being tapped to-day by someone. Someone is gathering funds from big business to-day to publish this sort of nonsense in an attempt to frighten farmers against their own marketing schemes. I think that is very deplorable.

Yesterday all the hon. members received a telegram referred to by the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) along the same lines, sent out by the Ontario Elevators Association. The language is somewhat similar.

This telegram reads:

"We object to the amendment permitting organization of pools of commodity groups; re-establishment of central selling agencies and allowing marketing boards to acquire property and machinery if needed."

and so on.

This organization apparently is also determined to stop the farmers having control or continuing control over their own produce.

I would like to point out to the House that at the present time before any group of farmers can establish or initiate a marketing scheme, the Hon. Minister (Mr.

F-6

Kennedy) required them to have 75%, I believe, entitled to vote ---

MR. KENNEDY: 66% who are, entitled to vote, to vote for the scheme. That is a high percentage. I see the Rural Co-operator expresses the opinion that they see no reason why it should not be a mere 51%; but, we require 66%; so that, in the first place, there is no suggestion that any of these marketing schemes of the farmers being ordered around by the government or by anybody else. I think the Department leans over backwards to make this democratic and to see that a good, large majority of the farmers are in favour of them and behind them. I will not deal any further with the Rural Scene.

I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) that he try to restrain some of these radicals in his party who go around the province making completely irresponsible statements, and frightening the people about legislation which is perfectly legitimate and which is perfectly democratic.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Who is it?

MR. DENNISON: I am referring to none other than your friend, ex-mayor Jamieson Bone.

MR. DUNBAR: We will expel him. He is out right now.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. members of the House will remember this is the same Jamieson Bone who, during the last railway strike, said in his official

F-7

organ that if he had anything to do with it, he would turn guns on the strikers. Such irresponsible, revolutionary statements, to be coming from Conservatives!

MR. DUNBAR: What item is that under?

MR. DENNISON: This was in the property owners' paper last fall.

The farmers, I am very happy to say, are not taking this propaganda too seriously, officially; that is to say The Rural Co-operator, understands this for what it is worth and they value it for what it is worth. It is, as they put it, "Bone Meal".

The Rural Co-operator undertook to debunk some of this propaganda and they selected Mr. Jamieson Bone as perhaps the chief mouthpiece for the propaganda. They offered in their columns a prize of a suckling pig and one hundred pounds of pig starter for the best letter in answer to ex-mayor Jamieson Bone.

MR. MacLEOD: What is pig starter?

MR. DENNISON: Pig starter is the food they feed the little pigs after it stops sucking the mother and up until the time it ---

MR. McEWING: I might say he uses it before he starts.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) informs me that it is what puts the curl in the tail of the piglet.

The letters to the Rural Co-operator indicate to me, at least, that the leadership of the farm movement of this province and particularly the readers of this paper are not going to be fooled by the kind of

F-8

propaganda which is going out against the marketing schemes by these individuals who are being paid by somebody. I do not know who pays them.

I would like to quote from one of these letters. This person is Alfred S. C. Tebbitt, St. Ann's, Rural Route 2. He says:

"I do not think I ever laughed so much in reading the Rural Co-operator as when I read Brother J. Bones effusion in the issue of February 13. As 'cornerman' in a minstrel show he certainly would be a scream. Would you not engage him to write a weekly column for our paper and call it 'Bone Meal'? For sheer hogwash it is good enough for pravda, being deficient in thought value, low in fact and high in sludge."

I could read letter after letter describing the thoughts of the farmers with respect to this propaganda. I am wondering, in view of that propaganda which is going out, and some of it by members of the Progressive Conservative Party, I am sorry to say, and I would like to see the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) repudiate these radicals in the party ranks. In view of this propaganda going out, I wonder if \$17,500 is enough to put the truth before the farmers in this province. A great many farmers might not read the Rural Co-Operator; they might read some newspaper out in the country published by men like Jamieson Bone and supporting the extreme radical wing of the Tory Party, the wing which is against all co-operative

F-9

marketing. We could increase this item, I think. We have a job here to do preventing this propaganda.

MR. McEWING: Under the Co-operative Marketing Branch, we heard considerable last year about the market terminals, or super-duper markets being built somewhere around here. What is the progress with respect to that, and at what stage is it at the present time? How soon will it be available.

MR. KENNEDY: I received a letter from Mr. Howe last week, I think, saying we could not have the steel for it. We have all contracts let.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Louder.

MR. KENNEDY: I received a letter last week from Mr. Howe. I have not it with me. It pointed out the steel shortage. There is a shortage of 1,800,000 tons of steel for such work in Canada. Until that is caught up with, buildings such as these, no matter how essential they may be, should not proceed. We could have made a nice start on it.

MR. McEWING: Has anything been done on it?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. The farmers are selling there now, of course. The building is not started but the contracts are all let to the tenants. They give us a legal cheque for a certain amount of money.

MR. ISLEY: I wonder if the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) could tell us what part of that \$17,500 is for services and expenses in connection with the administration, inspection, organization and development under The Credit Unions Act?

MR. KENNEDY: The Credit Unions Act is doing

F-10

business now. It is only 17% rural. They have on deposit now the unbelievable sum of \$27,000,000. There are 516 credit unions in the province of Ontario. During the life of the Credit Union Movement in Ontario, which has not been long, as you know, they have netted \$90,000,000 for the members. That is big business. When I get into the millions, I do not know what they mean. I think perhaps the credit unions should be in another department.

MR. NIXON: Have there been any failures?

MR. KENNEDY: No. One man skipped out.

MR. ISLEY: I was pleased to hear what the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) just said. I was wondering if this would not be an opportune time to set up an extra branch, The Department of Co-operatives, and put all your co-operative movement under this branch, put all the co-operative unions in the movement under that department.

MR. KENNEDY: That is a thought.

MR. ISLEY: I think it is well worth considering, because, after all, the co-operative movement is growing in Ontario and the day will come when you will have to put it in a separate department, anyway.

MR. MacLEOD: On Vote 4, if you do not mind, Mr. Chairman, coming back to the onions, again, really, does the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) not think that it would be the fine thing for this province to take those onions out of the buildings at the Exhibition Grounds and send them to India or some of the countries where widespread famine exists at the present time? There are millions of people

F-11

starving.

MR. KENNEDY: We have a special fund down at Ottawa which has been used for apples in British Columbia, apples in the Maritimes, potatoes in the Maritimes, and many other subjects where Ottawa takes over at a certain place and sends them out of the country or gives them away. It is \$200,000,000. Ottawa bought apples from the Maritimes and processed them into apple sauce. They sent them around to institutions. That is their business; of course, we have been negotiating with Ottawa about it. They know all about it since last fall.

(Take G follows)

G-1

MR. MACLEOD: You mean you took it up with them last Fall, and nothing has happened since?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. MACLEOD: The 265,000 bags?

MR. KENNEDY: It is not anywhere near that number now.

MR. MACLEOD: What is it?

MR. KENNEDY: I would not like to even guess, but I know it is nothing like that; not a quarter of it.

MR. MACLEOD: Under the circumstances, should not new representations be made to Ottawa with a view of taking that food out of the Exhibition Buildings, and sending it where it is needed? Should you not make a new effort to get Ottawa to underwrite the cost?

MR. KENNEDY: As a matter of fact, one of my men is up at the Marsh today, with the growers, to see what can be done about it.

MR. MACLEOD: The onions are not up in the Marsh.

MR. KENNEDY: Oh yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding on Vote No. 5, I have received a note, I presume, from one of the hon. members, who wishes to speak on the annual question of ragweed.

On Item 5.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very glad that whoever sent you that note is out, so that I may have the opportunity of speaking on this, in the first instance.

In all seriousness I appeal to the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) and to the government, to soften under this appeal I am making to them annually, about the ragweed

1874

G-2

situation in the province. I have appealed to the government year after year, but got nowhere very fast, but I still have hopes that the government will recognize the importance of this question and the seriousness of it to so many people.

MR. DENNISON: In other words, you will sneeze it through.

MR. SALSBERG: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I want to make my appeal on humanitarian as well as on economic grounds. The fact is that countless number of citizens of this province are seriously affected by the ragweed in the Fall of every year, and if for no other reason, except for humanitarian considerations, the government should do much more than they are doing at the present time to relieve the suffering of so many people. I suggest there are good economic reasons why the government should begin to act in the manner they have not yet done, because it would be impossible to calculate the losses suffered in the economy of this province as the result of the indisposition of so many people during that season.

If the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) would only keep his eyes open, he would see literally streams of tears shed by people in this province when hay fever time comes around. I am not exaggerating, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) well knows. Thousands shed tears -- involuntarily, of course -- and the government should be moved by this stream of tears which passes by their doors, at that time. Mr. hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) if all the people should sneeze at one time in one unit, and sneeze together, they would shake the foundations of this building, and perhaps get some results, and I am only hoping that this government will call an election

late in August or early in September, and I would then bring together, ^{without} any difficulty nor much effort, tens of thousands of enraged citizens, who would storm the very Heavens to defeat this government for its failure to take care of what, to them, is a most important problem at that time of the year, and also to their families.

Fortunately, the front benches of the government seems to be free of hay fever sufferers. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) who is now in convulsions is not a sufferer of the ragweed evil; he can get into these convulsions at any time of the year. But the government does not realize what it means to the families of the hay fever sufferers. They become very irritable and difficult; it is just impossible to be with them, or live with them, and I am sure there would be enough votes from the sufferers and their families to defeat this government.

Let us look at what the government is doing. They are bringing in an estimate for the expenditure of a grand sum of \$64,000, an increase of \$2,000 over last year, and that \$64,000, Mr. Chairman, is to be used for the following; administration of the Weed Control Act; Seed Potatoes, and important work, surveys, and traveling expenses, printing, advertising, and other educational work; purchases of seed, and equipment, prizes, trophies, and awards and such other work as may be directed by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy).

All that is to be taken care of out of this \$64,000. Little wonder that we are witnessing such a calamitous situation in the province, and I am not referring to the general interest of the province, aside from the interest

G-4

of the hay fever sufferers. You know, the ragweed is steadily and relentlessly moving northward, like a flame. Every year it reaches a more northerly point, and I say that unless it is stopped, the entire Muskoka area will become covered by this horrible weed, and people will run away from the area, rather than go to it.

MR. WELSH: That is a very unfair statement. Muskoka is no worse than any other section of this province. I want to point out to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) that obviously he does not know that ragweed is not the sole cause of hay fever. There are dozen of allergies.

MR. SALSBERG: I appreciate the interest of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh), and I would like the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) to become as disturbed as the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh). I did not say Muskoka was the worst; in fact, I think it is much better than some places, but I did say that unless we do something, to stop this movement of the weed northerly, it will create a condition where people will run, and I do not want them to run. I say that the hon. Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecile) should be given this Department. I think he would really "go to town" if it were put under his control. Or, if that is not feasible, let us give it to the Hydro Commission, because the Chairman of the Hydro Commission is a hay fever sufferer, and now that he is going to look after the Hydro and telephone poles, all through the North, he may be the one to look after this ragweed.

Imagine what it would mean if the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) could advertise in the United States, "Come to Muskoka; free of hay fever"; you would have millions

G-5

of American tourists up there in the Fall.

You are now dealing with a very serious matter, and I want to appeal to the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) in all seriousness at least to set up a special appropriation for ragweed, not just "weeds", and take the control of this weed out of the sundry estimates. Let us have an item for ragweed clearance; let us have a person or two in charge of it, and let us really come to grips with that evil, before it gets to a stage where we will become completely helpless.

You will need a lot of help in an election, whether it is a general election or a by-election, in September. I will be there -- loud-speaker or no loud-speaker; you will remember the Bill whereby loud-speakers are not allowed -- but I will bring all the coughers and sneezers who will trounce the Tory candidates as they have never been trounced before.

AN hon. MEMBER: Oh no, not that.

MR. SALSBERG: Do not think any hon. member can escape it. If you come up for an election, you will be defeated, by all those who suffer from hay fever. I am warning the government about that, and would ask them to do something. If the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) cannot do the job, let them put it under Public Works, because the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) is recognized as a man who gets things done, and I am sure that he will very quickly clean up this mess, and the province will breathe freely again, and the families will be able to enjoy family life for at least two months of the year, which is now denied them, because of the inactivity of this government.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On Vote No. 5, Item 6 "Freight on

G-6

agricultural lime". The estimate last year was \$25,000. This year it is \$30,000.

I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) could tell us, first of all, what tonnage is represented by this estimate of \$30,000?

I would also like him to tell us whether he is satisfied with the progress we are making in this matter in Ontario, having regard to the large areas in such counties as Haldimand and many others? Is it more than a nibble, or does the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) think we are making progress? I would like to hear from him in regard to this matter.

MR. KENNEDY: In 1940, it was 4,471 tons. Last year it was 40,102 tons used. There has been a steady increase every year, showing the necessity for the use of lime. I can send you over a list of the counties which use it. We are using a new approach to this matter, now, that is, the use of trucks, and Ottawa pays one-half, and we pay one-half, and the railroads give us a reduced freight rate.

I know that in Sudbury, for instance, they used 62 carloads of lime in that potato district in Pleasant Valley, and almost every county and district is using lime now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That would represent about 50,000, would it?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Based on the figures of the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) gave for last year. I do not know whether last year's estimate was over-spent, or under-spent, but, roughly, it looks like about 50,000, as represented by this estimate now before us of \$30,000. At the rate of perhaps 1 ton to an acre, that would be about 50,000 acres.

[illegible]

MR. KENNEDY: That is a very large application. I think you would find it would average about 200 pounds to an acre. I use half a ton, and that is a very heavy application. I think 200 pounds would be an average application.

MR. T.D. THOMAS (Ontario): If the Federal Government is paying half of it, --

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is only for freight rates.

MR. KENNEDY: The lime is very cheap. It is ground lime, and you can get a truck load for very little. I am not sure just what the price is. I should know, because I pay for it. I know it is very, very cheap.

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington North): About a cent a pound.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): \$1.75 a ton? How would that be?

MR. KENNEDY: That all depends on the transportation. We may pay \$1.00, if it is a considerable distance. I know it is very, very cheap per ton. This, of course, is only for transportation, not for the price of the lime.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I am still not satisfied. I know this is a subvention, and you cannot force people to do something they do not want to do. But does the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) think we are making sufficient progress?

I have in mind a county, which I will not name, where we are told there are 100,000^{acres}/of land which need lime. This may be one of the more unfortunate counties in that regard. Up until recently the average of lime imported into that county has been around 1000 tons, and at that rate, it

will take 100 years to get around the county, because the representative with whom I was speaking, said it would require about one ton to the acre. That particular county is within 50 miles of the source, and they can get the lime cheap get the subventions, and from my latest information, they are only using about 1000 tons a year.

MR. KENNEDY: They can get the lime for less than \$1. an acre.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You know the county I mean.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. We say that lime is essential. Without going into details, it breaks up the soil, so that what is needed for crops will come up. I use a tremendous amount of lime myself.

MR. T.K. FOSTER (Bruce): Before we go, Mr. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) I would like to take item 4 in Vote No. 5 of the "Weed Control Act". Have you had much difficulty with the enforcement of the Act in the province of Ontario?

MR. KENNEDY: It is improving very rapidly.

MR. FOSTER: Last year a case came up which involved the county weed Inspector, and even today I think there is a judgment standing against one farm, and there is not any doubt but what we should go into a little more detail in regard to this Weed Control Act. I simply draw that to your attention. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) knows of this case. Also I would like to see the man who is enforcing this Weed Control Act given sufficient power so he can go out and do it.

Vote No. 5 agreed to.

On Vote No. 6.

MR. T.H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Is the hon. Minister

(Mr. Kennedy) prepared to make a statement about the appointment of the new Dairy Commissioner. Is that the proper title for him?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. ISLEY: Does that come under this item?

MR. KENNEDY: Four years ago we made extensions in four of our branches, but it is very hard to get the qualified man. I have had men come from the States, and from different provinces, but they could not visualize what we wanted here. This man, Biggs came from Eastern Ontario. He went up to Guelph. He was President of the Student Council for four years. He was a champion boxer, and a champion debater up there. He is a returned soldier. He went overseas, and came back with an English wife, and went as Assistant representative to Middlesex county, and went to school there. He is a University graduate, and took special courses, and went to France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, England, Scotland and Ireland. I received a letter from his special instructor saying that very seldom had he seen a man with the capacity this man has. He came back, as a representative in my county, and I was very much impressed with him, and he will be the new Commissioner on Monday.

Vote No. 6 agreed to.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

MR. McEWING: Mr. Chairman, vote number seven, "Farm Economics Branch", covered quite a wide field. I wonder if the Minister could tell us if he has made any progress in exploring the possibilities of finding out the price spread of food products. I think he made the statement publicly three years ago that there was too big a spread, and that the farmer was only getting about 31% of the proceeds of the apple crop at the price at which it was sold on the markets, and he thought he would appoint a committee to find out where the difficulty was, where the spread occurred, and what the proper spread would be. He proposed to set up a cost department. Has anything been done along that line?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. I have a cost department over there now. The percentages vary with different commodities. In apples it is 80, in celery about 20%. Where there is great bulk, marketing is very costly. If the farmer puts his product up in a container and sells it, he gets a larger proportion of the consumer's dollar. But year by year, the farmer is getting less of the consumer's dollar. Several factors enter into that. It is a rather large subject. But the closer the farmer and the consumer get together, the better it is for us all. That is what we are trying to achieve. I think that a terminal market will be a great advantage both to the farmer and to the consumer. Taxes on food are tremendous. We tax our food and then we complain about the cost. We need further exploration into that matter, especially as it affects the north country; and we believe that by other methods of bargaining, we

H-2

-- for instance, we have an official whose special duty is to look into the matter of containers of food and vegetables, transportation and other costs of our commodities will be reduced.

MR. PARK: I agree with the Minister when he says that better methods of marketing, and putting the farmer and the city worker closer together so far as purchasing habits are concerned, are all to the good. But I think the Minister himself could do more in exposing these spreads. He did it once before. In 1947 he made the statement which got quite a considerable amount of publicity, concerning the spread between what the farmer receives and what the urban consumer has to pay. I think the Minister might very well repeat that more frequently. One of the most interesting things about the price of foods in the last year is that the index of prices to the farmer has been going down, while the food index and cost of living index have been going up. If I recall the figures correctly, the farmers food index went down eight points in the year November 1949 to 1950, while the cost of living -- the food index as part of the cost of living index -- actually went up fifteen points. So there we have a discrepancy of 23 points in food costs, and the cost of that discrepancy is coming out of the pockets of the farmer on the one hand, and the urban consumer on the other. I would like to see the Minister, by spotlighting this fact, giving it all possible publicity, threatening some of the profiteers in the food industry. He could work to

expose them once in a while. As I say, he did it well in 1947; I wish he would do a little more of it to-day. I think I suggested that a year ago in my Throne Speech contribution, I suggested to the Minister -- and as he was not present at the time, I repeated -- that it might be well for him to establish a consumers' bureau in his Department to direct the light on these facts, I believe the effect would be not only to lessen the margin between urban and rural people, which would be a very desirable outcome, but those who are perhaps exporting both classes might be brought to heel.

Vote No.7 agreed to.

On Vote 8 -- Farm Labour Service.

MR. ISLEY: I wonder if we could find out from the Minister what area the Farm Labour Service branch is in, and is now serving?

MR. KENNEDY: Western Ontario along the lake-front, along Niagara and along Lake Ontario, and I think a county east, where special crops are grown. The camps assist the growers with placements.

MR. McEwing (Wellington North): Have the activities decreased? I notice that in 1940 the salaries were almost double what they are in the Estimates this year.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Under Paragraph 4 of Vote 8, I wonder if the Minister would tell us just what steps the Department takes to establish people on farms that are in disuse. I imagine the question comes under the heading of Item 4, in connection with "transporting and placing workers in farm camps and on farms." I don't know of any steps that are taken in the

H-4

cities. I think it is something that might well be considered, both in the form of advertising, and also of classes in agriculture in the urban centres because it might surprise the Minister what a number of urban people they are who had their early start on the farms and who would, with some encouragement, go back to the farms, if certain steps were taken to encourage them in the matter of classes in agriculture, and the "know-how" imparted to them, if they were given some "knowhow" as to how to go about acquiring a farm and how to operate it when they do acquire it. It might be possible to step up agricultural production.

MR. KENNDY: I had not thought about it. It is a thought worth having.

Vote agreed to.

Vote 9 agreed to.

On Vote 10 - Livestock Branch.

MR. T. R. DENT (Oxford): Regarding Vote 10, Live Stock Branch, we have a little matter for concern up in my county. There are a hundred farmers who are using artificial insemination to get their dairy calves. We find that that saves the farmer keeping a vicious bull around, and we also find that the farmer is able to use much better bulls collectively than he could individually in his own herd. Now what my farmers up there are concerned about -- and I might say that there were twenty thousand calves born last year in Oxford County of which 49% were bull calves and 51% were heifer calves -- is a statement that was made by your Liberal

March 29th, 1951.

H-5

Leader, -- and, I would like to say, not the sitting Leader, but your fictitious Leader outside, --

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): He is not a fictitious Leader. You will find that out in time.

MR. DENT: -- and you should put this man right before he makes too many mistakes, and does the Live Stock industry a lot of harm too. This is the statement Mr. Thompson made, printed in the Windsor Star of January 27 this year:

AN hon. MEMBER: He was just "Shooting the bull".

MR. DENT: (Reading)

"The man from Pickering does not believe in artificial insemination as the best way to breed a good herd of cattle. For one thing, he says that records prove that in many cases, nine out of ten calves are bulls, which is not economical for the farmer.

Possibly the bulls used for insemination are not too carefully chosen, but Mr. Thompson says he can look at any herd of cattle and pick out the calves that are naturally born and those which have come from artificial insemination. He claims there is no doubt about the natural calves being of much higher quality--"

than those conceived by artificial insemination. Now I remember at the Royal Winter Fair last year the Grand Champion Holstein Bull and the Grand Junior Champion heifer and bull calves were both conceived by artificial insemination. So I am quite sure that the calves born

from artificial insemination are not inferior in any way to those conceived by natural breeding. Probably I am one of the pioneers in this province in artificial insemination in the cattle business. I have owned one sire that has 1500 offspring registered to his credit in the United States and Canada. One of his sons, conceived by artificial insemination from Mr. Kennedy's riding sold for \$20,000. Another animal from Dr. Stewart's riding sold for \$17,000. One from Elgin County, 6 months old, a heifer at that, sold for \$11,000. to an American breeder. So get the idea out of Mr. Thompson's head as soon as you possibly can that artificial insemination is not a success. I want to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) for the assistance he has given to artificial breeding in the province. We do feel that before you people across the way come into power you must change the mind of your Leader, should he become Prime Minister, so that no setback will be given to the breeding of good dairy cattle and beef cattle in the Province of Ontario.

MR. McEWING: We will look after that.

MR. OLIVER: Rising to take part in this interesting discussion, I would not seek to detract from the eminence that my honourable friend from Oxford (Mr. Dent) has gained in the live stock breeding world, but I would say to him that as a live stock breeder I think he should recognize that Mr. Thompson also has a record which is rather favourable. I do not know where my hon. friend got the statement he has just read. I doubt very much if Mr. Thompson ever said that; and as far as my friend

H-7

from Oxford (Mr. Dent) is concerned, when he wants us to revise the thinking of Mr. Thompson, we intend to revise the thinking of a good many of you fellows across the way.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition):
I wanted to ask the Minister a question under Vote 10. Under what item is assistance given in connection with provincial bull sales? I see here a grant to the Beef Cattle Improvement Association.

MR. KENNEDY: Item No. 4.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The vote that is already passed?

MR. KENNEDY: No: Vote 10, Item 4.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, "Educational and Demonstration Work in any Branch of Live Stock". Is that correct?

MR. KENNEDY: That is correct.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I say that I think it is an excellent way of encouraging the production of better beef cattle in Ontario. I do not think a better way could be found, at the moment anyway, to achieve that end. But what is it going to cost this year? It is not broken down here. It would not be very much, would it?

MR. KENNEDY: \$24,820. for all of the Province of Ontario.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And the Federal Government also contributes? Is there not a Federal contribution?

MR. KENNEDY: No.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I thought it was their intention to assist in that same thing.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. We are doing it our selves now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, I congratulate the Minister

March 29th, 1951.

H-8

on doing it. I think it is good, and I wish it could be pushed a little further because I do not need to tell the Minister that there are a lot of inferior dairy cattle being sent to slaughter houses from Ontario farms, and there could surely be no better way of improving that situation than a wide distribution of better bulls.

MR. KENNEDY: We are doing it, -- making it wider this year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is it intended to do to make it wider?

MR. KENNEDY: By local sales. We are giving something to local sales that we never gave before, -- like Grey or Huron or Lanark County. We give them a sum of money, so when they have their annual sale it will be helpful.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am glad to hear that, because after all, the number of buyers at the provincial sales so far -- I think there have been three or perhaps four provincial sales.

MR. KENNEDY: Three.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The number of buyers so far is after all rather limited and I have no doubt a great deal of work has been done, but there are still thousands of producers who raise cattle for beef and economically because the beast is an inferior beast, and who are therefore not making as much as they could, and who at the same time are sending an inferior product to the market. I would like to see this province come to the place where our beef cattle would stand as high in reputation as our dairy cattle.

MR. KENNEDY: I would like to see that too.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We have not got there yet. We are a long way from getting there; and I am sure the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Dent) will not shed any tears if our beef comes to the same high reputation that our dairy cattle now enjoy.

MR. D. B. McMILLAN:(Kent East): Under Item No. 7, I would like to ask the Minister how many demonstration farms we have in the province.

MR. KENNEDY: Five, in different parts of the province.

MR. ISLEY (Waterloo South): How many municipalities in Ontario are taking part in the warble fly treatment under The Warble Fly Control Act, and will there be more encouragement to the municipalities to adopt the provisions and regulations under the Act?

MR. KENNEDY: 75 municipalities have taken grants. We have paid \$17,812.

MR. ISLEY: Is there any way of encouraging all municipalities to take part in this?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. We give 50% of salaries and 50% of the cost of operation, and we encourage municipalities in every way to come into it.

Vote No. 10 agreed to.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

On Vote 11.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition):

Mr. Chairman, on Vote No. 11, I regret that I must now strike something of a sour note. This will be no surprise to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) because I have discussed it with him on a good many occasions. Under The Milk Control Act, as it now is and as it was before last week -- and as it was in 1948 and before April 1, 1948 -- regulations could be made, usually by the Milk Control Board with approval by order-in-council. So, it is quite clear that the responsibility for those regulations is the responsibility of both the Board and the Government, and I am sure the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) would not want to dodge or evade any responsibility for the regulations, or the way they are administered. I know he would not want to do that.

There is a great deal which can be said about the regulations under the Milk Control Act. At the moment, what I am interested in are the regulations relating to bonding. The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. I must say very frankly to the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) and to the Committee that the regulations relating to bonding have not worked out as well as they should have. The general impression was given that under the bonding system the farmer was going to be protected if a dairy failed -- the producer, at least, was going to get his money. That was the purpose of the bonding system. The Milk Control Board was not going to licence a distributor unless it

I-2

had proof of financial responsibility and bonds had to be filed under the regulations.

I think the Committee should know just what happened in a recent case of failure on the part of a dairy. I think the ~~former~~ hon. members, and certainly the milk producing hon. members of this House would certainly be interested to know something about the practical results. I will not ~~tell~~ a long story, although it is a very long story, which I have followed very closely ever since its inception. Here are the very bare facts of the situation.

In the early part of 1948, the Milk Control Board asked a company known as Toronto Dairies Limited to increase its bond. It was not considered to be adequate because their business apparently was growing. The company did effect some increase and protection by filing with the board some Dominion Government bonds which the company owned. That provided \$4,000 additional security; but the bonds supplied by the Wawanesa Mutual was only the amount of \$14,000, so that the total protection available to the Board and to the producers through the Board was \$18,000. The Board asked the company to increase the bond. The company could not get an increase in the bond and said so. If the Board had been tough about it, it could have suspended the licence and put the company out of business; but, who wants to put a company out of business? I am sure the Board did not wish to do that when they thought there was some chance that the company might pull through. I know the producers did not wish

I-3

to put the company out of business when they were supplying milk to it. The long and the short of this was that the company went on and things went from bad to worse until, as the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) knows, in August and September the company failed, the company defaulted.

Eventually, under pressure from the producers and also some pressure from me, the company passed a resolution to be wound up voluntarily under The Companies Act. Of course, then it was all over. Mr. Chairman, there was owing to the producers the sum of \$47,219.40. I repeat, \$47,219.40; that was in respect of milk supplied in August, September and October, 1948. What happened? From that date to this, Mr. Chairman, the producers were paid 38.33% of their money, and that is all. Every cent they got was the money they got from the Milk Control Board, a \$14,000 bond from the bonding company, a little over \$4,000 realized on the sale of the Dominion Government securities deposited with the Board by the company -- a total of a little over \$18,000. That represents 38.33 cents on the dollar of the money owing to the farmers. From that day to this, that is all those fellows have received. There was over \$1,200 owing to one of these farmers. That was his livelihood. That is how he makes a living.

Under a bonding system which is supposed to protect the producer, all he got, and all any of the other farmers have got so far is about 39 cents on the dollar. I know that they are likely to get more. This

happens to be March, 1951. I know these fellows are going to get more money, perhaps in June, July, August, or this fall, or next spring, because the trustee liquidating this company has some funds in his hands. There has been a great dispute about whether he should pay the same money out of the assets of the company to the producers that he paid to the other ordinary creditors. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) knows something about that. I want it to be clearly understood, because I think it is time we faced it, that this bonding system is not good enough. There are too many loopholes in it. I will give one or two examples.

Example No.1: When the Board asked the company to increase its bond, the bonding company, of course, knew that this company was in trouble. It knew this company was in trouble, I repeat; the bonding company had the right to cancel the bond on sixty days' notice. That became a probability. In order to induce the bonding company not to cancel the bond, the dairy took \$3,500 worth of Dominion Government securities which it had in its kitty, and deposited those securities with the bonding company as security for the protection of the bonding company, negotiable securities to the sum of \$3,500. The bonding company carried on. I repeat, the bonding company carried on and held \$3,500 against the \$14,000, it might be called upon to pay. The Milk Control Board did not know anything about that, or that the assets of the company had been reduced secretly by \$3,500, so that there was ultimately \$3,500 less available for

I-5

distribution to the creditors. When that matter was disputed before the Master of the Supreme Court, the Master held, I think, correctly in law, that the Wawanesa was entitled to retain the \$3,500 in Dominion Government bonds which it had taken as security for continuing with the bond. The point is that, without the knowledge of the Milk Control Board, the assets of the company were diminished to the extent of \$3,500 by a private deal between the dairy and the bonding company. The bonding company was \$3,500 to the good, the creditors of this company are \$3,500 worse off. The Milk Control Board could do nothing about it, and there was no possible way in which they could know about it. That is example No.1.

You see what can happen, is that the bond can be a complete bluff. The company can be bonded to the tune of \$10,000 and can deposit practically all its liquid capital with the bonding company to cover the bond. Then you have the Milk Control Board paying the producers part of their claim, but nothing left in the kitty of the company to pay the balance of their claim, as there should be, if the bonding is to be more than a fiction. If the bonding is to be a reality, it should be a bond which the bonding company will pay without going into the other resources of the company. I think I suggested to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) on a previous occasion that this bonding system would work far better if the provincial government set up an insurance fund, and if the distributors, instead of having to coax these bonding

I-6

companies into putting up a bond, if the distributors paid a premium into that fund which the Milk Control Board could distribute without further ado, if the need should arise there would be adequate protection. I might say that the bonding companies' premium appears to be one per cent.

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In other words, if you are a dairy and you have to be bonded, you are going to be bonded to the tune of \$10,000, your annual premium is \$100. That is the premium which was paid to the Wawanesa in the case I mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, this is even worse than I mentioned, because the Milk Control Board was not able to realize the money immediately. Here were a group of farmers in Durham County and elsewhere in the Toronto milkshed who needed their money and needed it badly right away. They were not like the trade creditors, who have a few dollars here and there owing to them; they were a people making a living by selling milk. The Milk Control Board demanded payment of the \$14,000 from the Wawanesa, and, Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) must know what Wawanesa did. They said, "We do not think we have to pay this. Somebody is of the opinion that this company will eventually pay 100 cents on the dollar. We will not pay you." The Milk Control Board had to sue them to get the money. I think it took nearly a year for the Milk Control Board to recover the money from Wawanesa. That is

not good enough. That was not the purpose of the bonding system, that the Milk Control Board should have to go out and waste a year's time trying to collect money from a hard-boiled company like Wawanesa.

MR. KENNEDY: We will not take its bonds now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You will not take its bonds now?

MR. KENNEDY: No.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think you are very wise; but in the case of these fellows of whom I am speaking, it is rather late in the day. These fellows had to wait nearly eighteen months before they received a nickel.

MR. KENNEDY: That is about right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And they will have to wait another eighteen months, at least, before they get anything more. I think it is a terrible thing. It certainly means that our bonding system was not as good as we had hoped it would be. If the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) had an insurance fund up here supported by premiums paid by the distributors, there would have been no difficulty about collecting on the bond; payment could have been made to the producers immediately they proved their claim. It could have been done the next day. I am sure the cheques would have gone out very quickly if that had been the situation.

I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) has given this problem a lot of thought, but I think it has been allowed to drift on much too long. I think something has to be done about it. I am not prophesy-

I-8

ing doom or anything like that, but there you have the fact of a dairy failing. There are other dairies in this province which could fail. They are not all making handsome profits. I think some of them are doing very, very well, but there are a number of smaller dairies which are not doing well. Then, let us not pretend otherwise. These people could pay it.

I want to serve notice on the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) and the government right now that I am not being very rough on you about this case of the Toronto dairies -- I have been probably too easy with you so far -- but you have had your warning, if this should happen again, and it could under the present bonding regulations, there would be no possible excuse for your failure to improve the bonding system. No possible excuse. It could happen again.

How did the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) or the Board know what kind of a deal may have been made between some of these dairies and the bonding company? How does the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) know that the bond is adequate? In the case of the Toronto Dairies Limited, the bond turned out to be entirely inadequate -- less than 40%. What kind of protection is that? I could tell the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) and the Hon. members of the House a lot more about it, because it is quite a complicated affair, but one thing it certainly proves is that your bonding regulations in 1948, 1949, 1950 and 1951 were wholly inadequate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, when the new Milk Control Board was passed in 1948, it became effective on

I-9

April 1st and we had a new act in effect. It took this government until the following February to pass new regulations under the new Milk Control Act. Talk about speed and efficiency, I think that is just about the pay-off! That tops it; for the record; ten months to pass new regulations under one of the most important statutes on the books.

There was apparently an impression abroad, at least there was an impression somewhere in the Milk Control Board, that until the new regulations were passed, the Milk Control Board did not have the power to do what perhaps ought to have been done in the Toronto dairy dispute. I have looked into that. I am now speaking as a lawyer, rather than as a farmer. I think it is wrong. I think the Board had all the powers necessary under the old regulations, even after the new Act became effective. My reason for saying that is to be found in the Interpretation Act.

MR. KENNEDY: I agree with that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) as a lawyer, rather than as a farmer, agrees with me the power was there. I think it is either Section 15 or Section 16 of The Interpretation Act. There is provision that where a new Act is passed to take the place of another Act, where you are repealing one Act in order to substitute an Act redrawn, the regulations under the old Act, so far as they are not inconsistent with the new Act, continue in full force and effect until the new Act has its own regulations. That is to be found in The Interpretation Act of this province.

I think it means that the Board, after April 1st, 1948, had all the power necessary, in theory at least, to deal with the Toronto Dairies Limited case. I think they have that power to-day. What assurance can be given to us now, Mr. Minister (Hon. Mr. Kennedy) that the next time a dairy goes broke the experience will be any different from the experience in the Toronto Dairies Limited case? How do I or my neighbour, who is shipping milk to-day, know that he will not find himself facing a defunct dairy, which has defaulted, supposing they owed him over \$1,000 for shipments? How do we know he will not have to wait for over a year before he gets anything from the Milk Control Board on the bond and perhaps three or four years before he gets anything from the trustees of the bankrupt company? What assurance can be given to us that the Department or the Board have learned any lesson from this case so that something like this will not happen again to-morrow?

I am so fond of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) that I do not like to raise cain about a matter of this kind, but, you know, if it happens again, I would certainly have to raise cain in a large way.

What has the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) to say about this?

MR. KENNEDY: What the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said is quite true. Bonding has been a worry to us for some years. What

I-11

you suggest we tried to do as well. We tried to operate by simple fund. We were told legally we could not do it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You mean the big dairies objected to it?

MR. KENNEDY: No. That was a very nasty situation. This invariably happens. Six weeks goes by, the milk has gone up in price and the bond has not gone up as well. The Board has talked about it, and talked about it and have raised the bond in some cases, but no one knows better than the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that there are some very shaky distributors in the province. We are watching them and we hope we can get a bond and we hope by putting daily payments into the bank from the farmers each day -- say, if they buy \$300 worth of milk, that day \$300 has to go into the bank in the name of the board that distribute it. We were very much worried over it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You mean in connection with these daily payments the bank undertakes to supervise these collections? Would the board be notified?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the distributors defaulted?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. We have inspectors on the job all the time. We have daily, weekly, bi-weekly payments to protect us. It is not 100% protection, but it is the best we can do at present.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But, does that not involve the Board, or the inspectors of the Board, exercising discretion, and

I-12

exercising judgment about whether a certain distributor should pay daily, weekly or every two weeks? That is where the element of human fallibility is going to enter in -- is it not?

MR. KENNEDY: That is right.

(Take J follows.)

J-1

MR. KENNEDY: That is right, Sir.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I mean where the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) agrees with me, and I am not clear about what is being done.

MR. KENNEDY: It is a hard thing to work out. I will give you an example, about which you probably know. We advised the producers "Do not ship any more milk to that man", but what happened? The next day every farmer shipped that milk in, and said "I will take a chance". That is a pretty hard case to handle. You may put this money into the bank, and finally another dairy took the operations over. It is hard to work out in every case, but we are doing the best we can. I am just as much worried as any hon. member in the House; more so, because I am the man who will get the blame. I do not put it off under the Milk Control Board. I take the blame for everything that happens in my Department.

MR. NIXON: You are not suggesting you will make the losses good.

MR. KENNEDY: Not unless you raise the pay a bit.
Votes 11 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

ON VOTE 14:

MISS MACPHAIL: This has to do with the Women's Institute. I think very highly of the Women's Institute. I have belonged to it for many years, and, Mr. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) I feel that sometimes the hand of the government, regardless of the party in power, is a little too heavy on the policies of the Women's Institute.

MR. KENNEDY: Not mine.

MISS MACPHAIL: I am very glad to hear that.

I belong to the old U.F.W.O., the Women's Institute, and the Federated Farm Women of Ontario. I find a different spirit in the old U.F.W.O., and the Federated Farm Women, than in the Institute. They have no lead strings. There was much more enjoyment for a person of my type to be a member of the U.F.W.O. or the Federated Farm Women than the Institute, much as I like them, and much as I appreciate the good work they are doing. And the same thing is to some extent true of the Junior Farmers. I noticed here a vote which passed when I was out of the Chamber, in regard to the Ontario Radio Forum, \$2,000. Please do not subsidize the Radio Forum too much, because they are a virile organization. In fact, I do not think there is anything better in radio. If you go into a community, where they have the Forum, you find an aroused, independent thinking people. You do not find that in a heavily subsidized organization. Much as I like the Women's Institute and the Federate Farm Women, I feel there is a tendency on the women to be over-conscious in what they are thinking. I have never felt over-conscious myself, but it has never got me any place. Perhaps I should have been. I feel that in the Women's Institute they are always thinking of all these "taboo-es", by the Department, and I do not like that. The women in the Institute are capable, intelligent women, and I would like them to just be themselves on every subject, no matter what it is. Of course, I suppose the government changes off and on, but where the same government is in power for a long time, I think it is true, as it is in the junior farmers, that they tend to accept the policies of the government in

power, and there is something vicious about that, because many of the people of Ontario are used to training the minds of youth in the direction in which the government wants it to go. I think we will have to be very cautious about that. It is quite a big vote for the Women's Institute. I am not finding fault with its size, nor for it being as large as it is -- \$125,500, but I want to see all the lead strings of the government released. It is not the money of the government after all; it is the money of the people of Ontario, and I do not think in the cases I have mentioned, the Junior Farmers, the Women's Institute, the Radio Forum, and so forth, there should be any tendency on the part of any government, regardless of what government it is, to get the thing running this way. There is nothing I would like better than to see the restrictions removed. I do not like them at all.

I have attended many meetings of the Forum and the Women's Institute, and I am speaking now from a long experience, and I think the Women's Institute should be enlarged to give service to all farm women's organizations on such things as home economics, the various courses which are given, the training schools, and things of that kind. I do not think we should curtail it; I think the Department should give service to all organized farm women. I do not think it matters what kind they are, whether they are members of the Federated Farm Women, or the Institute. The Federated Farm Women, do not get the service. Why do they not?

MR. KENNEDY: I do not know, I am sure. I can vouch for this, that never, in any shape or form, since I have been Minister, have I interfered with the Junior Farmers,

Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance. Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 26, 1892. Postpaid at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1914.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1911.

Postpaid at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1914.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1914, by American Medical Association.

Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.

Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 26, 1892. Postpaid at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1914.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1911.

Postpaid at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1914.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1914, by American Medical Association.

Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.

Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 26, 1892. Postpaid at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1914.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1911.

Postpaid at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1914.

Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Copyright, 1914, by American Medical Association.

Printed at the Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription orders, notices of change of address, and other communications should be sent to the Editor.

Advertisements should be sent to the Business Manager.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 26, 1892. Postpaid at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1914.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1911.

Postpaid at Chicago, Ill., May 1, 1914.

J-4

the Women's Institute, and so forth, and I am sure the hon. member (Miss MacPhail) will believe everything I say about that.

MISS MACPHAIL: It may be that they like the hon Minister (Mr. Kennedy) so much that they veer that way, but for some reason or other, they do not get the service.

MR. L.F.K. FELL (Parkdale): Before the Vote is carried, may I ask a question of the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy)? I have looked through the estimates trying to find some estimate or vote for the Union Stock Yards here in Toronto, but I cannot find it, and I was wondering where it was wondering to have it discussed.

MR. KENNEDY: There is a separate vote in here for the stockyards. All the vote is for is to pay the salaries up there of the men, and then we do some injections of serum. Ottawa gives us the serum, and we inject it.

MR. FELL: The reason I raise this point, is because I would like some information. I also have some information I would like to give to the hon. members, and it has to do, to some extent, with the Union stockyards.

MR. KENNEDY: Do it now.

MR. FELL: All right, I will. This is a problem which has been brought to my attention, and it involves the stockyards, because the question begins at that point. It is the question of processing the hogs by the packers, and my information is that the hog raisers lose a considerable amount of money between the time they sell their hogs, and the time they receive their cheques. Perhaps some information can be given as to how this comes about. I think they are paid on the basis of processed weight, which means

The first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

the first of these is the fact that the
the first of these is the fact that the

that after all the processing at the packing house has been completed, the hog raiser is paid on the basis of what is left hanging on the rail. I think this is important. If the hog raisers have not raised this question before, I think it should be noted here. For instance, when a hog raiser receives his cheque for that hog, he is paid on the weight, less such things as the kidneys, liver, intestines, and certain other parts of the animal, and those products are all used by the packers. Somebody might say, "All right, let them have the liver, the heart, the lungs, and other things, and reduce the weight from what they are receiving now". Whether that is a fair argument or not, I do not know. It seems to me that the hog raisers are losing in the transaction, and they should be receiving a more adequate compensation for those things which are commercialized by the packing house industry.

It is only a matter of figuring out an approximate weight. If a man sells a herd of swine, he may be losing a considerable amount of money. One thing which happens is in connection with the weight of the hog's head. Everything is used in the packing house, the only thing which escapes is the squeal, and in processing the head, it is severed at the back of the neck, and at one point it may be left hanging by a thin strip of flesh, and quite often that strip of flesh is broken by the weight of the head, which may weigh anywhere from three to six pounds, Once the head falls, it is condemned, and there are three or six or even eight pounds lost to the hog raiser right there, and if he has a number of hogs, the amount lost is considerable.

J-6

The reason for raising this question is to ascertain whether or not the Department has been informed of this situation, and if there has been anything done. I think the hog raisers are at the mercy of the packers from the time the hog gets to the stockyard. They go in, and are gone, and the raiser gets a cheque, and all he can do is to say "Well, maybe it is all right".

I would suggest that the Department of Agriculture, particularly in the province of Ontario, should pay a little more attention to what happens to that hog, once it goes through. The hog raiser is losing money, and the packing industry is in there, to take everything they can lay their hands on, and what falls off, or gets kicked around the floor, is lost.

I would suggest that if the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) has not had ~~this information~~ before, he should be interested enough to enquire from the hog raisers just what the situation is.

I have just received a note saying that the squeal goes to Scotland for the bagpipe manufacturers.

MR. KENNEDY: This is the first I have heard about that. I will certainly make enquiries.

VOTES 16 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

ON VOTE 22:

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): In this Vote we have the sum of \$8,000,000 for the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario for rural primary and secondary lines, and I presume that in this vote, it is about the only opportunity an hon. member has to discuss the various aspects of the Hydry administration throughout the province.

There has been a number of press reports and considerable publicity in connection with the transmission lines which are

29th March, 1951

J-7

being built in various parts of the province, and the treatment the farmers have received at the hands of the Hydro Commission. I think the publicity this has received has been all to the good, and I believe under the new Committee which was set up some very interesting information was given this morning with respect to increased provisions for better payment of the farmers for the losses sustained when these lines are constructed across their properties, and I think there was a very great need for improvement in this connection.

For many years I have frequently protested the manner in which the farmers owning property used by the Hydro in the construction of these lines have been used in the past, and whenever I had any influence it was given in the direction of the farmers, that they should receive as equitable and fair treatment as it was possible for the Hydro to give. After all, this tremendous corporation spends many, many millions of dollars on these projects, and the amounts that are paid to the farmers for the damage that is done to their properties is but a very, very small proportion of the cost of the project in full.

(TAKE "K" FOLLOWS)

29th March, 1951

K-1

The Prime Minister said the other day that in a lapse of ten years the Hydro would spend a billion dollars in connection with the development of its projects. With everyone, you have got to have a distribution line stretching across the country, and a very small proportion of that one billion dollars, in the final analysis, will go the property owner to compensate him for his losses.

Three years ago there was a high tension line running across the county of Brant, through my riding, and I wish to give you some examples of the manner in which landowners were treated, and how absurdly inadequate was the provision to compensate the farmers. Here is one instance. The Hydro man cut a strip 55 feet wide on each side of the right-of-way, making it 150 feet. To the right of where they cut were 1200 trees which were 20 years old. They were tall and straight. The trees were left lying in all directions; and it cost around \$300 to get them cleaned out and cleaned up. One tower was erected. The compensation for tower and work was \$81., for trees, \$425.; damage to crop and lane, \$75. I have some personal knowledge of this particular incident. The document containing this information is signed by Mrs. Martha Harvey, of Ancaster. I took this up with the Hydro, and the Chairman promised his personal attention to the matter. I heard nothing further from that, but I asked Mr. Harvey subsequently what additional amount he got, and he said 1:00. Well, that is just adding an insult to an injury. Mr. Harvey said, "What can I do, fighting against this great Hydro Corporation? We simply had to take what was given to us." Certainly there was no suggestion then that the Hydro Commission would

29th March 1951.

K-2

appoint an officer to help them arbitrate or determine what the proper amount of damage was. I have seen this gash through this man's wood lot. It was a property of which he was very proud. The trees stood there on each side, as straight as spears. It was really an inspiration to see a wood lot like that in that part of Ontario. The trees were not of any great diameter, but they were just at the point when they were growing into real money; and Hydro paid for them at the rate of 35 cents a tree, -- a tree 40 years old, and on land which had been kept for pasturing in all those years so that the trees could flourish and grow into a cash crop. Those trees were simply left there in a jack pot. The farmer himself was sick then, and he is now, and he was not able to go with an axe and saw and clean them up; he had to have the work done; he paid \$300 to get it done. If you subtract that from the \$425 he got, it left him less than 11 cents a tree for a 40 year old tree, which was just in ideal shape to grow into some real money. No one would suggest that is even a pittance as a compensation for what this man suffered in his bush-lot. He has that 150 foot cut angling through his bush-lot. That land is of absolutely no use to him for all time to come. He cannot grow anything there; he still has to pay taxes on it -- or if not, I am subject to correction -- the Hydro does not own the land, the farmer owns it. There will never be any tree grow on that land for all time to come, because as soon as they get to be any size they will have to be cut as they will interfere with the wires. In addition, to paying taxes on land which

K-3

is absolutely useless to him, the municipality will see that he keeps the wood cut on the lot in a proper condition.

If I wished to do so, I could recite many instances. The farmers got the rawest deal from the Hydro any one can possibly imagine. I say in all seriousness that this situation must be corrected, or ^{there is} going to be a lot more heard about it in this House than there has been in the past.

And then these people went to farm after farm, without any advance notice, at the time when the damage was the greatest to the crop, and with their big machinery they just ran hog-wild all over the farms. Here is an instance: Mr. Harvey Charlton -I passed this on to the Hydro, and I hope they are paying some attention to it. Three years after the damage was done there was a bill for damages to the crop of \$1810. on which the farmer has not yet received one cent to compensate him! He went through all the trouble of putting in 75 acres of wheat, 25 acres of canning factory corn, and 10 acres of peas. A great deal of his crop was ruined by the operations of the Hydro, and three years afterward he has not received one cent of compensation. He said: "I have been trying to get a settlement on this for three years but have only succeeded in having a few professional men call on me to pare down parts of this account under promise of an immediate settlement." That is the sort of treatment we have received from the Hydro when they constructed this line through Brant. Probably the cases that were more serious have come to the attention recently, but without exception no adequate settlement has been made. The farmers were most dissatisfied

The first of these is the fact that the
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...

The second of these is the fact that the
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...

The third of these is the fact that the
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...

The fourth of these is the fact that the
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...
... of the ... of the ... of the ...

with the treatment they received at the hands of the Hydro Electric Power Commission.

You give a Commission of this kind such wide authority as has been conferred on the Hydro Commission, and that authority should be used with moderation and common sense and consideration for the other fellow's viewpoint. I tried to point that out to my hon. friend, the Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) the other day when he brought in a Bill giving the Gas Corporations power to expropriate farm lands. This is a dangerous power, and it is a power that must be used with discretion and with a view to being fair to the landowner. I sometimes wonder if we are not coming to the point where the farmer who owns the land has less rights on it than somebody else who wants to come and interfere with those rights; and things have surely come to a funny pass when they can come in without your leave and ruin your crops, cut down your trees and leave them lying there in a jack pot and give you no consideration whatsoever. Just to give you another example, I know of an instance where they put a line -- and this was a small pole line -- through a farmer's flats; it was Phillip Loeb, south of the village of St. George. He had a very large pasture there, and there was only one tree in that pasture. It was a very large beautiful maple. It was at some distance from the Hydro line. There was no limb anywhere near the lines. It might have been mathematically possible, if the tree blew over in an exact position, that the top could have struck the wires. But without consulting the owner of that land

29th March

K-5

they went in and cut down that beautiful maple tree. The owner almost wept over the treatment he had received. I do suggest that, important and necessary though it is for the Hydro Commission to carry their lines across the property of farmers everywhere they go, they could be a little bit more considerate of the farmer's rights before they go in and chop down his trees and destroy his crop without a "by your leave" or even an advance notice.

I think I will leave it at that, Mr. Chairman. I do not wish to take up further time of the House. But I do feel that we have a great grievance in the way we have been treated in the past. I sincerely hope that, under these new regulations, farmers who have to have their land used for these purposes in the future will get much better treatment than we have received.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I say that there are many points on which I find myself in complete agreement with my hon. friend. I feel that the urban centres of this province^{which} need power for their operations have no right to expect the farmers of this province to donate their land for nothing. That is my view. I think that if this means increased power rates, it should mean increased power rates. There is no rime or reason for asking, because of public necessity, that people should give up their lots and their farms for nothing, or for next to nothing. I want to make that plain.

(TAKE "L" FOLLOWS)

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

L-1

My hon. friend the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies), who represents the government on the Commission is authorized and instructed to see that the farmers get a decent deal in connection with the extension of power lines. Now I say that without reservation. I feel that these great lines--and they cross my country now in a big way--these great lines involve of course some arbitrary powers, you cannot avoid that in running them through perhaps for hundreds of miles. You have to have some arbitrary power, but I do say that there ought to be decent compensation paid--I should say more than decent, I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) in this, that supposing a line is cut through a bush lot or a piece of bush, what possible use is that land forever to the farmer or to the land owner? In my own country I have got--I was going to say hundreds of miles--I guess I have got hundreds of miles of that type of power line; it is all very well to step in and pay that man something for the timber that is cut off, but what about the land? The land is absolutely of no use from that time on in most of those cases, particularly where it runs through a bush lot. What can you do with it? I do not think the land is really worth anything. The fact that the power line is there means really that acreage is lost.

MR. NIXON: It is a liability.

MR. FROST: It is a liability in many instances, and I think that we have to so regard it. Now, as regards procedure, I want to get my hon. friend's (Mr. Nixon) views on that subject. After all, he used to sit over on these treasury benches for some nine years.

MR. NIXON: That is right.

MR. FROST: Now, how about procedure? I am not satisfied that our present procedure is right, and I think most of that procedure was invented during the time that my friend the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was Provincial Secretary, and my hon. friend the member

for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) was sitting in the position now occupied by the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies). How about the procedure? I think myself that the procedure perhaps might bear some betterment, but what? We admit that the Commission must have, in the interests of the people, arbitrary powers. Now, is there a procedure that is better than the procedure that we have at the present time?

As regards the compensation rates, these have been very much bettered. The hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) will explain that in a moment, but they have been very much bettered; whether they are sufficiently bettered or not, I do not want to pass on that, I want to make sure that they are sufficient to meet what are very clear damages that these property owners suffer.

With that explanation, with giving you that as a matter of government policy, my hon. friend (Mr. Challies) can give the particulars of what is being presently done.

MR. H. W. WALKER (Welland): Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to report to this Assembly that Monday morning, along with my colleague the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), a group of farmers got together and interviewed the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Youck) and myself regarding this power line that was coming through that area.

I think a lot of the trouble, Mr. Chairman, is due probably due to the appraiser, the land appraiser who goes through there representing either Niagara Falls or Hydro. Some very conflicting statements have been made, for instance one farmer who had purchased the land from an old lady, the Hydro back in the years I believe approximately 1916 gave \$50 for a thirty-year lease, and the appraised assessment on that particular land is roughly between \$1.00 and \$1.50 an acre, that makes approximately \$120 she is paying back in taxation

March 29, 1951

L-3

for 30 years for four and a half acres for which she received \$50.

There are other farmers where this new venture is following number 20 highway, where the property is worth somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200 or \$300 for every sixty feet as building property, and that area is now building up as a residential area and they are taking a 300-foot right of way which is in 1949 Estimates at the sum of \$145 for approximately 150-foot right of way.

Now I think, Mr. Chairman, a lot of these difficulties could be straightened. The people in the area realize that Hydro is a must and that this venture must go through, and if it were just a case of some individual farm who was in disagreement, probably trying to get something that is not a satisfactory arrangement from the Hydro, then there would be some reason for disbelief, but when farmer after farmer in a continuous line along the project are complaining over the treatment, then it seems to me it comes down mostly to the land appraisers.

There is one particular appraiser who two years ago was supposed to come back and see those farmers regarding their grain crops. Now those crops have been harvested and there is nothing that an appraiser could come back and settle with the farmer upon. We have had complaints now that towers are being built in the middle of wood lots in the Niagara Peninsula, without the farmer in question having been asked to "terms" or having made any particular arrangements or agreements about that particular field. There is quite a misunderstanding by all concerned there.

In approximately 1916 one farmer got \$865 for approximately 60-foot right of way and then again some years later on the second transmission line, he got \$900 for approximately 75-foot right of way, and now in 1949 he was offered \$145 for a 150-foot right of way.

L-4

Now those are just approximate figures, Mr. Chairman, which I have quoted from memory as the committee was talking to us, but I felt that a lot of these difficulties could be ironed out by promptness and probably somewhat of a fair committee of land appraisers in that area. The farmers in that particular area are very anxious to get this straightened away, as some farmers have plans for building lots, and what have you, and the new power line will take away all those privileges of the best land, and most of that land down there is selling for \$1000 an acre. You are getting into the fruit bearing lands, where you cannot buy some land at \$1000 an acre.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, we appointed a Hydro committee the other day---of what, twelve hon. members of the House; they met this morning, and I was quite interested, I just asked the hon. Minister for Hydro (Mr. Challies), and nobody asked the question at all down there. That is what the committee was appointed for.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Oh, yes, they did.

MR. FROST: I wish they would go down there and have a real discussion on that point and get the thing ironed out, because I want to see the farmers get justice in this matter. How about reconvening this committee and going down and discussing this and having the thing out and finding out about it.

Apparently this morning, if there was any question asked, there was not apparently very much time spent on it. Now, let us have the thing out.

MR. HOUCK: Mr. Chairman ---

MR. FROST: Now tell us what you did in the nine years you were over here.

MR. HOUCK: Well, are you going to talk or am I?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. C.W. COX (Fort William): I will let you talk first.

MR. HOUCK: Then, Mr. Chairman, may I say in reply to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost), I am on that Hydro Committee and I feel, and I think the hon. Vice-Chairman of Hydro (Mr. Challies) will agree, we held a very fine meeting and solved a lot of problems there this morning.

MR. FROST: Did you deal with this one?

MR. HOUCK: It was my understanding that as a Committee we were not to go into a dog fight on those details.

MR. FROST: But you were sent there for the purpose of--

MR. HOUCK: Can you not wait until I finish? Give me a chance to speak.

MR. FROST: I am going to ask this Committee to go down and have another sitting on this question and nothing else, and let us hear about it.

MR. HOUCK: I want to tell the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) that this very question was raised and discussed with the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies), and one of the Commissioners--

MR. FROST: Better have the dog fight in there than here.

MR. HOUCK: -- and I think the Chairman is giving it attention, but might I say in regard to the meeting with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Walker) that those people were objecting to the fact that they have been given the "run around", not so much by the Hydro Commission officials, but by their agents down in that territory.

They had a man down there by the name of Johnston, and those property owners have gone to a Mr. L. B. Spencer, a personal friend of the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost), to see if they could not have a settlement. Mr. Johnston was there in 1949 and said: "I am going on my vacation, I will be back in a couple of weeks and we will settle the matter then". He wrote them in November, 1949 and said: "I will be

L-6

down shortly". They have not seen Mr. Johnston since that time. Mr. Spencer got in touch with Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Spencer wrote the property owners in 1950 that he had a letter from Mr. Johnston that he would be down within the course of a few weeks. Mr. Johnston has yet to put in any appearance to meet those people.

Many of those farmers have borrowed money and need this money for the whole line that has gone through their property, and no doubt the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) will take it up with the Hydro and see that at least some settlement is made.

Any may I say that I think some of the holdup has been-- and the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) will bear me out or will tell me if I am wrong-- that you have something in mind in regard to the Niagara tunnel going through, taking up land on the farmers instead of land where the line is going through at the present time, but the property owners would be satisfied if you would send Mr. Johnston--or, I think it is Mr. Hustler--

AN hon. MEMBER: Mr. Hustler? He should be the right man.

MR. HOUCK: -- if he went down there, and would see that some settlement is concerned.

MR. FROST: Did my hon. friend (Mr. Houck) ask any questions this morning about these pole lines?

AN hon. MEMBER: What is that to do with it?

MR. HOUCK: We started at 9 o'clock and we were in there until a quarter after twelve.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, may I say this --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Just a moment, my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison). We appointed a committee of this House composed of twelve members --

MR. DENNISON: The committee is not finished yet.

L-7

MR. FROST: -- two of them from this side of the House over here, to deal with these questions. I do not know of a more practical question they could have dealt with than that one, and I am surprised to find out they met this morning and only a couple of questions were asked.

MR. HOUCK: We got a brief on it.

MR. FROST: I am going to ask the hon. Vice-Chairman (Mr. Challies) to reconvene the Committee and get the matter settled.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, when on that committee I understand the Chairman read a lengthy brief of some 53 pages and no one was given a chance to get in the discussions of this kind, and after all, this is the place to bring up these matters.

MR. FROST: What did you think the Committee was for?

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, this question was discussed this morning. Have the members of the committee forgotten what went on there this morning?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: I don't think they knew what was going on, some of them.

MR. DENNISON: We were told this morning by the Chairman that in his opinion this matter had been settled to the satisfaction of all concerned. He said that the amount paid for a steel tower, which previously was \$50 had been raised to \$75.

MR. NIXON: How far back has that been made retroactive, may I ask?

MR. FROST: Would you like it made retroactive back to 1934?

MR. NIXON: Absolutely.

MR. FROST: That is when you were in power for nine years and did nothing.

Hon. T.L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): I am all for that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Wait till I finish the schedule. Next is the twin pole. They had previously received \$13.00, they will get \$37.50 for each twin pole. The next is the single pole and anchor, for which the farmer previously had received just \$5.00 and which is now increased to \$12.00 a piece. That was given out this morning --

MR. FROST: Was my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) on the committee, or was he just down there?

MR. DENNISON: No, I was down there and I was on the Committee, and we did discuss this. I am amazed at the lapse of memory of this Committee.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: You see, it all goes over their heads, they do not know what goes on.

MR. DENNISON: But, Mr. Chairman, I brought this matter up last year with the hon. member of the Hydro-Commission in the House, (Mr. Challies).

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): You put the wrong people on that Committee.

MR. DENNISON: And I would point out that in some cases it is not so much the question of the poles, but it is the right of way, and Mr. Sanders this morning assured us that they are now going to pay increased amounts for right of way. The right of way which was previously 52¢ per rod for a 20-foot right of way will be \$1.20 per rod for a 150-foot right of way. This is a 50% increase over the rate in force from 1947 to 1950. So that the complaints we had last year on right of way are going to be slightly aided.

I agree in every other respect with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the

L-9

Hydro should charge a sufficient amount for its power to consumers to see that no class of consumers, be they farmers and very anxious for Hydro and in many cases willing to put up with a good deal of inconvenience to get it, that no class of consumers who happen to be unfortunate enough to be on the Hydro right of way be penalized.

MR. COX: Mr. Chairman, when I listened to my hon. friend here (Mr. Houck) talking about the raw deal that the farmers received and listening to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost), who was in such an apparently receptive mood about it, probably it is about time I should talk on behalf of the people of North-Western Ontario, because I think if any group of people ever did get a raw deal it was the people at the head of the Lakes in connection with the Hydro development there. I think I discussed this last year, particularly referring to the Aguasabon project that cost approximately \$12,000,000, and I think the eventual cost of \$16,000,000. The facts are these; I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the fundamental principles of Hydro were not followed out in Northern Ontario. Hydro is fundamentally power at cost; is there any reason why these paper mills should have one rate, and the consumer in the two cities another rate?

MR. FROST: That has nothing to do with this Estimate.

MR. COX: Well, we are talking on Hydro, and I think this is very important to the people up there.

MR. FROST: No, no, this is rural Hydro.

MR. COX: I beg your pardon?

MR. FROST: This is rural Hydro.

MR. COX: Well,--

MR. FROST: Wait till my hon. friend (Mr. Cox) speaks on the Budget.

MR. COX: I thought it was very opportune.

MR. FROST: No.

L-10

MR. COX: Then when can I talk on it?

AN hon. MEMBER: On the Budget.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): But on that very point, is this not the item upon which we can discuss Hydro?

MR. FROST: I do not think all Hydro should be discussed.

MR. OLIVER: What other items are there we can discuss it under?

MR. FROST: Let me get it straight for a moment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Get it straight, get it straight.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, this item refers to rural Hydro, and I think my hon. friend the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was quite right in raising that point. It is right on the beam in connection with rights of way required for these lines running across farmers' property and it seems to me an effective point to raise.

Now, as regards Hydro generally, we have of course the Budget and the Throne debates in connection with all of Hydro problems. My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) asked for a Committee in connection with Hydro, in order that some of those problems that were difficult to discuss in the House might be brought closer to the peoples' representatives by way of a Committee. I was quite convinced by his arguments and the result was that we formed such a Committee. Now I can assure my hon. friends there is not any idea of stifling the work of that Committee. If there are things that my hon. friends want to ask, certainly ask them in that Committee.

I think that my hon. friend the member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) has on the committee a former Commissioner, one who ought to be very familiar with anything in connection with Hydro, because he was down there for a number of years. He has a representative who ought to be able to get these things--and that, I think is the proper place to ask those things. It is, I think quite proper, of course, to make speeches

L-11

in relation to this matter on the several opportunities offered in the House, but this Estimate here deals with rural Hydro and I think it should be confined to that. This is not opening up the whole Hydro question.

MR. OLIVER: Well, it always has been.

MR. FROST: Oh, no.

MR. OLIVER: Oh, we always did.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, let us be fair about this.

I think the Committee this morning made a good start. Not all hon. members of this House were there, there were only two hon. members there from the Liberal Party and there were four or five from the Conservative Party. It is true that Mr. Sanders presented a very lengthy brief, but I thought the time was well spent. To be factual about it, it took about one hour and twenty minutes to go through the brief, then in the time which remained a great many questions were asked and Mr. Sanders answered most of them, I think generally to the satisfaction of the Committee. But it would be ridiculous to deduce from the fact that the committee met for three hours or more this morning that the ground was fully covered. That simply was not possible.

I agree that this matter did come up, and I think that Mr. Sanders himself would be the first to say that further questions remain to be discussed, there are for some examples on which he wanted to get the information before giving an answer.

MR. FROST: When, may I ask, are you meeting again?

AN hon. MEMBER: Ask the Chairman.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think that was left to the Chairman, was it not?

AN hon. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, it was left to our good friend the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Dent) to arrange that. After all, these men are busy men and we want to arrange it at a time that will be convenient.

Now, with reference to this particular point, I think it is quite proper for any hon. member to discuss, certainly, the Hydro-- the rural aspect of Hydro, under this vote, but I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should be technical about this. After all, there are no other Hydro Estimates, at least if there are they are pretty obscure, and my information and recollection is that in 1947 and 1948, my hon. friend the member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) took this item as his opportunity for making his speech about the Hydro.

MR. FROST: Well, he is going to speak on the Budget.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, I am not saying that he should, I think that is his option. Certainly if he wanted to make a speech about the Hydro this year on this item, and I am sure my hon. friend the member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) would not object, and I would not. I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should be too narrow about it. I know he does not want to get into a long drawn out discussion about Hydro at this point, but I mean, let us respect the right of private members to raise these questions and trust to their good judgment and sense of reasonableness not to carry it too far.

MR. FROST: Well, I am in agreement with that.

MR. COX: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) implied I had an opportunity this morning. I was at the Forestry meeting this morning, which I think is perhaps equally as important, and I had no opportunity of bringing this up before the Committee.

MR. FROST: Well, we have been looking forward to your speech on the Budget dealing with this matter.

L-13

MR. FOX: You are looking forward to it, are you? You might not be so pleased after I make it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We have all been looking forward to a number of speeches on the Budget. I wonder when they will occur?

AN hon. MEMBER: If ever.

MR. FROST: If we get these Estimates through, I can promise my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) we will have it on Monday--we will have a real debate on Monday.

MR. COX: I would like to bring that up again, I have a rather vivid recollection of a year ago when it was brought up, my hon. friend the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson)--somebody is showing me the clock. I know where the clock is.

MR. FROST: Do not look at that for a moment. Just a moment.

MR. COX: But I think it means a lot to the people at the head of the Lakes, several hundred thousands of dollars, and I think the people are unfairly treated and they should get a refund. I remember a year ago, and I think the former Prime Minister at the time (Mr. Drew) and yourself intimated perhaps that Aguasabon might be taken out of the Thunder Bay District and put in what is known as the Northern Ontario --

MR. FROST: I am in agreement with that.

MR. COX: You are? Then we will not quarrel over that, but there is one other point: When are you going to stop the bonussing of the paper companies?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. MacLEOD: It will only take a minute--now just a minute--I happen to be the member who either last year or the year before

L-14

proposed that we should take some steps to obviate and overcome the very difficulty we are in now. I suggested that there should be placed in the Estimates an item which would enable hon. members of the House to discuss Hydro as they discuss the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Public Works and so on.

MR. FROST: May I tell my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod), that was the purpose of having the Committee. That was the point.

MR. MacLEOD: I want to reply to that. You see, I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is being quite ridiculous. For instance, this morning the Chairman of the Committee on Lands and Forests was good enough to suggest that I go over to that meeting. Well, I wanted to sit in on it --

MR. FROST: That is open to every hon. member.

MR. MacLEOD: Just a minute. I went, but the place was so crowded that although I was the only member there who was not a member of the Committee, the place was so crowded that I had to leave. There was not even a place to sit down. Now, what would have happened if a dozen, or twenty-five or thirty hon. members had gone to that Committee?

Now, even if it had been possible for twenty-five or thirty hon. members to attend that Committee, with the privilege of asking questions, I suggest that the mere asking of those questions or the mere right to ask those questions there should not deprive hon. members of the House of an opportunity of discussing and asking further questions here.

MR. FROST: Well, I agree with that.

MR. MacLEOD: I know, but you are making it very difficult for people to ask questions, by saying: "Well, why do you not ask them down there?" Now, I am going to repeat the proposal that I made a year or two ago, that next year there should be placed in the

Estimates a nominal item which will enable the hon. Minister in charge of Hydro (Mr. Challies) to have his day in the House in the same way that other members of the Cabinet do, and the same thing applies to the Ontario Liquor Control Board, because there is no opportunity to discuss these things in the House at all.

Hon. G.H. CHALLIES(Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Chairman, may I just say, as far as --

AN hon. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. MacLEOD: Just a minute with your "carried". We want to hear what the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) says. He has been deprived of speaking. He has asked for the right to speak a number of times, and he has been side-tracked. We want to hear him.

MR. CHALLIES: I want to say in this question of my responsibility, I have felt, and as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) pointed out, each year I have made a report on the progress of Hydro during this year. That was ready, but unfortunately my illness prevented me from giving it. I hope that I can under the Budget cover some of the points that have been covered during the past year, and give another report for the year 1950 of the Hydro's activities for that year.

I will be very happy to go into those rates and the rest, because there is nothing to hide.

MR. MacLEOD: No, I am not suggesting there is.

MR. CHALLIES: The rates are set, and the position of the Commission on increased rates is a very excellent one of compensation to the farmers for their power, and the rest of it.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, let me make this suggestion. First, the Hydro Committee is meeting again at the call of the Chairman.

MR. MacLEOD: It is not a Hydro Committee.

MR. FROST: Or the Hydro Committee.

L-16

MR. MacLEOD: It is not a Committee on Hydro.

MR. FROST: I wish you would place as number one on the agenda the discussion of this right of way problem. I think that not only would they answer a good many questions, but if there are ways of bettering that situation, I think we should get down to it and better it. I think the farmers of this province and the land-owners have a very definite right in this matter and let us make sure that they get positive justice, in fact more than justice, that is what I would like to see. I think that that might be the first move in connection with this matter.

The next point is this: Next week, when we clear the Estimates away, my idea was to have the Budget debate continue, and the hon. Minister of Hydro (Mr. Challies) has, I think, a complete answer or-- not a complete answer, they were not framed as an answer; it is framed in the form of giving to the House information concerning a great many of these things, and I had hoped to have the hon. Minister of Hydro (Mr. Challies) speak on them early in the week.

That is one of the reasons I am anxious to get the Estimates cleared up today, so we can go ahead with some of these other matters.

MR. MacLEOD: But does not the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) agree that there is some merit --

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. MacLEOD: --in the proposal --

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. MacLEOD: -- of placing in the Estimates an item, apart from the Department of Agriculture, which will permit the very able Vice-Chairman of Hydro (Mr. Challies) to discuss these problems with hon. members? If he makes a speech on the Budget, there is no opportunity to ask for additional information. I am making this proposal in fairness to a very outstanding authority on Hydro who is not heard sufficiently in this House and who has a great deal of valuable information which the majority of hon. members want to hear.

March 29th, 1951.

L- 17

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, It was really that point that I had in mind when I acquiesced to the suggestion that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) made at the opening of the Legislature,

It seems to me there is a great deal of this class of information that can be very properly obtained in Committees. Actually, speaking, it is difficult here in the House by way of question and answer to cover these points. So many of them are mainly technical points. Now, my idea was to make it so that a representative committee of this House could go down to Hydro without being hurried or pushed, and could get a great deal of information on technical points that you could not begin to answer here. I had in mind that such an inquiring and inventive mind as that of my hon. friend, the member for St. David (Mr. Dennison), who no doubt has a lot of things he would like to ask, and I think beyond any possibility that we might answer them here.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, he is a member of the Committee.

MR. FROST: I beg your pardon?

MR. MacLEOD: He is a member of the Committee.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. MacLEOD: That is right, but where does that leave the other hon. members?

MR. FROST: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that this is the position. We have a Committee. The Committee, of course, is the normal voting Committee that we have, you cannot put everybody on such a Committee. On the other hand, I think we should have this understood, that if there

March 29th, 1951.

L- 18

is any hon. member of this House who is not a member of the Committee, that he should be enabled to go down to the sittings of that Committee, and, as a matter of courtesy, his questions should be answered, and, while it is true that he would not be able to vote, nevertheless he would be able to get the information that he requires.

MR. MacLEOD: I am afraid the rest would never sit at all in this case.

MR. FROST: But remember, all of the 90 hon. members of the House here are interested to some degree in the work of this Committee, but you cannot put 90 members on it. You have a dozen hon. members on the Committee and other hon. members have the right of going to meetings of the Committee and asking questions. That, I think, is the answer to it.

MR. MacLEOD: You have a Standing Committee on Agriculture which has had several meetings with quite a sizeable membership on the Committee, and yet it has taken all afternoon to deal with the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. MacLEOD: And no one will suggest that a foolish question was asked here this afternoon. All questions were relevant, important and to the point. You cannot solve it the way you are suggesting at all.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

MR. FROST: Well, we are experimenting in democratic government. We will try to find the solution.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I cannot be here at eight o'clock exactly and I want to be clear about

the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) intentions with respect to Estimates. This is Thursday and tomorrow is Friday, we have some time at least next week; what would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) like to do tonight?

MR. FROST: I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) that I was hopeful of clearing up the Estimates tonight, quite frankly.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What, all the remaining Estimates?

MR. FROST: Well, we have only three Departments, Usually the Provincial Treasurer is not too heavy. Labour has been discussed till I think the subject ought to be fairly well covered, that leaves only Lands and Forests, in which we have had a Committee sitting which I think would answer a great many of the questions, and hon. members of that Committee will continue to sit - I think we might try to clear the Estimates up tonight.

We are following out, I mean departmentally, a little different line next year. I was hopeful of having the Estimates all completed before the end of the fiscal year. I have many reasons for wanting to do that, among them being that instead of having, for instance, salary increases delayed say until the 1st of July and then made retroactive to April 1st, I have been having our Department work on salary increases with a view to making them effective in the month of April, as much as possible. I have hastened the tempo of all of the Departments with that in mind.

As soon as the Estimates are completed, I was starting myself next week, in my capacity as Provincial Treasurer, with the Treasury Board, to go over with each

L- 20

of the Departments a number of the matters that have been discussed here. We have been taking note of what has been said here and discussing with the various Departments certain matters relating to administration, so that it is really altogether desirable, Mr. Chairman, that we should have this cleared up before the end of the fiscal year, which ends on Saturday the 31st of this month.

Now, we only have three Departments and I think--

MR..JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, on former occasions, of course, when that difficulty has been encountered, for a few days at least it has been taken care of by resolution.

MR. FROST: Oh, well --

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is a form of resolution which can take care of it pretty well.

MR. FROST: That leads to complacency.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It would only be a matter of a couple of days at least, if you were to run into next week. With reference to these three remaining Departments and with the best spirit in the world and with no desire whatever to delay matters, I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that it is too much to attempt, The Department of Labor, the Department of the Provincial Treasurer, and the Department of Lands and Forests. It seems to me they are all important. I am not saying that they need take a great deal of time, I do not know, but to attempt three Departments of that magnitude after eight o'clock of a Thursday evening, I think is a mistake and I say so seriously.

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

March 29th, 1951.

L-21

MR. FROST: I would be content, perhaps, to have one of the Departments tomorrow, I would be content that we do two tonight and have one of them tomorrow. I think we might do that. I would like tomorrow to clear up some of the Order Paper in connection with committee work, perhaps for a portion of the time, and then we could sit through. I know some hon. members want to get away at 3.15 but I think that we could go through until, say, five o'clock,. I would be quite content to do that, with those who could remain here, and cover whatever Department is left over until to-morrow.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, permit me --

MR. FROST: I am quite content to, say, take Lands and Forests and Treasury, say, tonight, and take Labour tomorrow afternoon, if that would convenience my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe).

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not know how it will work out, but permit me to say that I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree we have made good progress this week.

MR. FROST: That is right. Very good.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We were not here Monday, which left Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, and I think we have made pretty good progress. I do not think there has been anything in the nature of obstruction.

MR. FROST: No, that is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And when you come down to matters as important as these, I am anxious and am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is also anxious they should be dealt with and considered in the proper atmosphere, and

L- 22

not very late at night or very late in the week when people get tired. In fact, honestly I think they go through more quickly when people are less tired, than when people are tired. Because when people are tired, they get stubborn.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And somewhere along the road, someone will say: "Well, I am prepared to stay all night," and a dozen other people agree.

MR. FROST: I do not think we should do that, Mr. Chairman. Let me point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) another reason I thought we might clear up the Estimates; next week we have the Election Act, we will have legislation, at the present time there is a discussion between the York municipalities in connection with the matter of assessment, which has been quoted in the press; we felt that it was desirable rather than to rush that, to give the municipalities the opportunity of discussing the matter themselves and seeing what if any agreements might be arrived at.

I am hopeful that that legislation would be introduced on Monday. That leaves the Election Bill, and leaves the Budget Debate, Now, Mr. Chairman, I know what it costs hon. members to be around here, particularly those who are out of town, and I had hoped that perhaps we might be able to wind up the proceedings of the House, say, on Wednesday, certainly not later than Thursday. As my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) knows, there are some official functions on Friday which I think would make it desirable to get the House, if we can, prorogued

on Thursday. If we can gain a day and make it Wednesday, so much the better.

Remember, hon. members may be a bit frayed at the end of the week but that happens again next week, that always happens. Now, if we can just, as I say, keep our feet on the ground and try to get these Estimates through, I think it would enable us perhaps to deal with some other very important matters in a little bit more orderly way in the first three or four days of next week.

I just make those suggestion, Mr. Chairman; let us see what we can do.

Now with the matter of Lands and Forests, there is no reason why Lands and Forests should be all completed today. If the Committee wanted to meet for a morning or two next week, I would be very glad to arrange that. I think it is very desirable that that information be given to our hon. members and that they should have the opportunity of asking our people matters relating to administration and policy in that great Department. After all, the light of day does not do any harm, it is a great thing to have that happen and I am not anxious in any way to stifle discussion there. I really think, Mr. Chairman, that with Lands and Forests, while there are bound to be many questions asked on the Estimates, nevertheless, from a standpoint of really giving to our hon. members the information and the background of these things, more can be really done in the committee than anywhere else.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That may well be, although I think if I had been able to attend the Committee meeting this morning -- and I could not, because I was at the meeting

March 29th, 1951.

L-24

of the Government Commissions Committee -- according to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) I would have had no place to sit down.

MR. MacLEOD: That is literally true.

MR. FROST: Well, if that is the case, I would say, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why a Committee meeting should not be held in one of the committee rooms, Committee Room No. 1 or Committee Room No. 2, where there would be more room.

MR. MacLEOD: Why was it not?

MR. FROST: I will ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies) about that, but I do not think there is any reason why we should have our hon. members in the Black Hole of Calcutta, or anything like that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it was for that very reason and in the hope that some of the business could be done that way that I was going to suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he take Lands and Forests next week. That would leave only one departmental Estimate for the whole week, which is surely not an unreasonable assignment. However, all I will ask him to do now is to use his best judgment and not push the thing too hard.

MR. FROST: I would say --

MR. COX. Mr. Chairman --

THE CHAIRMAN: The hour is now 6.22. I do now leave the chair and we will reconvene again at 8.15.

MR. FROST: No, eight o'clock. An hour and three-quarters.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh,,oh.

March 29th~~k~~ 1951.

L- 25

MR. NIXON: You are getting to be a slave driver,
do you know that.

THE CHAIRMAN: 8.15.

The Committee took recess at 6.22 of the clock
p.m.

- - -

The Committee of Supply resumed at 8.15 of the clock p.m.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I am going to call the Department of Labour estimates next. It had been my intention to call the estimates of the Department of Lands and Forests, but the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) mentioned the fact that there was no room in the Committee room for him, then the hon. Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Jolliffe) felt that it would be better if the Committee met further and that the consideration of these estimates be postponed to one day next week, and that we would clean up these estimates of the Department of Labour and Treasury to-night.

I am most anxious that all information possible should be given to the Committee of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the meeting, I asked the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) about it. It was called in the Hon. Minister's (Mr. Scott) board room in the Department of Lands and Forests due to the fact that the maps and other material were there, for the consideration of the hon. members. Apparently the hon. members of the Committee sat around the table in the board room and the others, including the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) sat on the sidelines. Any other hon. members who wanted to come in were perfectly welcome. Members of the Press were welcome. If that does not meet the situation, let us straighten it out here and now, because we hold these meetings in order to give information to the hon. members and

March 29th, 1951

AA - 2

to the public.

As a result of what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) said, I consulted the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) this evening, after the recess. We are allowing these estimates to stand over until, I hope, Monday night at the very latest, because we are going to have our own time cut out to wind up the Session of the House. I will move that forward to Monday night, which will mean that this Committee can meet to-morrow morning, and on Monday morning. I hope that will be satisfactory and that we can have a discussion of these questions. There are no holds barred in connection with the questions the hon. members can ask of the officials and of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) for that matter.

Is there anything further that I can do in this? This is done to give the hon. members of this House the fullest possible information.

I do not want, nor does the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) want this to be just a mere matter of form. We are doing this in order to give the hon. members information. I do hope, as a result of the meetings of this Committee, it will not be necessary to endlessly rehash a lot of material discussed in the meetings of the committee. The committee is there to give all of the hon. members of the House information concerning that Department. As I explained this afternoon, there are twelve hon. members on that committee, but that does not prevent any hon. member of this House going to the Committee, and, indeed, although an hon. member of the House may not be

a voting member, I am quite satisfied that the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) would be glad, indeed, to have any of the hon. members of the House, as a matter of courtesy -- as has always been the case with respect to committees of this House -- ask questions. It is not a select committee; it is a committee of the House. I am not one for being too formal. I want to give to the hon. members of the House the fullest possible information. The fact of the matter is that the Department of Lands and Forests is doing a tremendous work. The ramifications of the Department of Lands and Forests in forest management, insect control, fire control, reforestation -- a great variety of subjects -- are subjects of the utmost interest. The committee is formed in order to give those who are really interested in the work of that department, the fullest information.

I again say that I do not want this to be a matter of form. If the hon. members of this House are not satisfied with the place the Committee met this morning then let us get a place which is more satisfactory. I quite concur with the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) that the room where the meeting was held this morning, being one where the maps and other material was, lent itself to the convenience of the hon. members of the House. I understood from the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that he had to stand up against the wall, or something of that sort. I inquired. He had as good a seat as the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). Now, let us get this straightened away.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I am very glad

March 29th, 1951.

AA - 4

the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) spoke as he did. If he is quoting the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests correctly, I suggest that he has not been given an actual picture of the situation in that room this morning. You say that the meeting was held over there because the maps were available and there was the Committee table and seats on the side, and that the officials sat on the sidelines, and the rest of the space was available to the hon. members of the Committee and any hon. members of the Legislature --

MR. FROST: No, the members of the Committee. The rest of you should sit with the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) on the sidelines.

MR. MacLEOD: I am not accusing the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) of making it difficult for the hon. members to attend the Committee. That was not my point at all. I simply pointed it out so the House will know that the meeting was held in a very small room, where there was seating accommodation for the hon. members of the Committee and the officials, and one additional chair. Actually, some of the officials had to sit in a little vestibule between the Board Room and presumably the office of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) or his deputy. That was the situation. If three or four hon. members of this House, had gone to that Committee room this morning, they would not have found a place to even stand, let alone sit. So much for the actual physical set-up. There was no room for anybody there this morning.

I think the hon. members of the Committee who

March 29th, 1951

AA - 5

are in the House to-night will corroborate that, if they choose to speak.

During the time I was in the room this morning, I believe the Committee heard from the heads of one or two divisions of the Department. The Committee adjourned before it heard from more than three. I do not think that the hon. members of the Committee would for a moment suggest that what took place there this morning makes it unnecessary for the hon. members of the House to discuss the estimates of the Department of Lands and Forests. If one were to follow the logic and reasoning of the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) insofar as the function of this Committee is concerned, then we would have to draw the conclusion that what the Committee --

MR. FROST: I do not wish the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) to misinterpret what I say. The point is that the Committee is there in order that any hon. member of this House can secure the fullest of information. That does not bar that particular hon. member of the House, of course, from coming before the Committee of Supply and asking questions; but certainly it must obviate the necessity of asking endless questions on technical matters which are available to the hon. members in that Committee. I would hope that these Committees would provide ready means of getting information without having endless repetition and discussion. After all, I assume the hon. members of the House are interested in getting information for the sake of information, and that it is not a question of

meeting in the committee and then rehashing everything which is said in the committee. Surely, if information is required -- and that is what we are so anxious to give -- that is the place to get it, and it avoids the necessity of asking questions on a host of technical subjects here, because we put before you the men who are running the various branches.

MR. MacLEOD: Frankly, I do not know what we are arguing about.

MR. FROST: The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) said that the room was so crowded he had to leave the meeting of the Committee before it was over, because there was no room.

MR. MacLEOD: That is exactly the case.

MR. FROST: Surely that cannot be right.

MR. MacLEOD: It is the case. I ask the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Grummett) as to whether there was accommodation for any hon. members of this House in that room this morning. Was there?

MR. J. L. McDONALD (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, there was a chair beside me on my left. There was never a man sat on it; nothing but an ash tray, while the meeting was in session.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I attended the meeting this morning. It was crowded, all right. Undoubtedly the intention of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) was good. He most likely thought that only the hon. members of the Committee would be attending; but, had there been more than four or five hon. members of the House attending, undoubtedly they

March 29th, 1951.

AA - 7

would have to stand up.

In connection with the Committee, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that we ought to put off these estimates until we have at least one or two other meetings. We heard from the heads of three different departments this morning. We were most interested in what they had to say. We want to hear from the rest of them. We would like to be able to recall some of the other heads of departments and ask them questions. We put off part of it this morning so that the heads could give us an outline of their different departments.

The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) suggested that we hold a meeting again to-morrow morning. The Hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) is holding his meeting in the Mines Library to-morrow at ten o'clock a.m. There are several of us who are on this Committee who wish to attend the meeting. I wonder if it could be arranged with the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) to call his meeting at, say, eleven-thirty a.m. We might finish the Mines committee meeting by eleven-thirty and it would give us a chance, those of us who wish to learn something about these departments, to attend both meetings, instead of having to decide which one we are going to give up.

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, I missed this discussion this afternoon. I am coming into it a little cold. I might assure the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), it was with the best intentions in the

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

THE JOURNAL OF THE

world that I held it in that room. We have had many large meetings in that room. The board table accommodates twelve, which is the number of the membership of the Committee. We would be only too happy to hold it where there is more space. However, the Hon. Minister for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) did not have to stand, because I brought him out a nice leather upholstered chair, from my office, he will remember.

The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) will remember that I suggested we hold another meeting to-morrow morning, but he brought up the point of the Mines Committee. Monday morning was suggested for another committee meeting. The feeling was that some of them might be there for it. So, it was left to the Chairman of the Committee to convene at the earliest possible date, to suit the convenience of the hon. members. Is that not your understanding?

MR. GRUMMETT: That is right, but I understood the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to suggest that we hold another meeting to-morrow, and he was giving permission that we hold one.

MR. SCOTT: I would be only too happy to fall in line with your suggestion, at eleven-thirty tomorrow morning and arrange that my staff be there.

MR. FROST: And also Monday morning, and we can go on with the estimates Monday night.

MR. SCOTT: I am only too happy to have the Committee discuss these things. The discussions might be more intelligent than they might be otherwise.

March 29thk 1951

AA - 9

MR. MacLEOD: That is just the point. Frankly, as I understood the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) this afternnon, he was suggesting to the House that since that Committee had met and perhaps would meet again, and after it had had a meeting or two, there would be no reason for the estimates from the Department of Lands and Forests not going through with a minimum of discussion.

(TAKE "BB" FOLLOWS)

MR. FROST: I would think so, I would think it would very greatly reduce discussion by doing that.

MR. MacLEOD: The point is this, the standing committee on agriculture appointed by this House meets every year at least once, and the discussions--

MR. FROST: Let me point out to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod), the committee on agriculture meets, but the committee on agriculture discusses specific things. We have appointed this committee to give to the hon. members of the House the widest scope. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I am anxious that at the meetings tomorrow morning and Monday morning it be wide open to the press, as the meeting was this morning. These are public meetings and they are for the information of the press. Everything that is information for us, is information to the public. Now, let us do that. I would say to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) that surely with these meetings there^{are} a host of questions you may want to ask that will be answered in this committee which will render it unnecessary to repeat them here. That was the point I made this afternoon.

MR. DENLISON: Mr. Chairman, I was informed that the press was excluded from the meeting this morning and I had one complaint from one representative of the press that he asked the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) if he could go in and he was told, "No".

MR. SCOTT: I would like very much to know who the member of the press was.

MR. DENLISON: I will tell the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) privately.

MR. SCOTT: You have stated one member of the press

March 29, 1951.

BB-2

approached me. One member approached me this morning.

The committee was sitting at the time and I told him the secretary of the press gallery was taking the minutes of the meeting. He was quite welcome to go in but he said he would not do so, that it was all right. Is that who it was?

MR. DENNISON: No, it was not.

MR. SCOTT: Well, then, he did not approach me.

Now, who was it?

MR. DENNISON: To tell the truth, Mr. Chairman, I do not know this person's name.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SCOTT: Who was it?

MR. DENNISON: I know his face but I could not tell his name if I were to drop dead right now. That is the truth.

AN hon. MEMBER: Drop dead.

MR. SCOTT: I would like to go a little further.

Immediately after setting up this committee I wanted to have meetings immediately. Tuesday, two of the Opposition, three of our own group, I do not remember how many of the Liberal group, were attending other committee meetings; Wednesday it was the same; Thursday, it was the same. I discussed with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and this Tuesday morning was the first morning, we could have this meeting. We held it at the earliest possible moment. I am sorry it could not have been held earlier. I would have liked to have two, three or four of these meetings and I am only too happy to fall in with the suggestion.

MR. FROST: The Committee will be held either in Committee Room No. 1 or Committee Room No. 2 tomorrow morning.

March 29, 1951.

BB-3

notices be on the desks in the course of a short time. I would ask the committee, please, if they require a further meeting after tomorrow morning, to meet on Monday morning so we can take the Department of Lands and Forests Estimates on Monday night. That ought to give everybody a better chance.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to continue this discussion but I want to make myself very clear since the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has singled me out.

MR. FROST: I have not singled you out, you singled yourself out. You said this afternoon it was too crowded.

MR. MacLEOD: You made a statement here tonight after you talked to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) which left me with the impression that I had misrepresented the facts concerning the meeting this morning. I insist what I said this afternoon was accurate, and there is no reason in the world why this should develop into a battle of brains between the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and myself. I feel firmly convinced that the setting up of this committee was a very wise thing to do and I think that when it has had an opportunity to meet this Session and at succeeding Sessions, it is going to make it possible to have a much more intelligent discussion of this importance department of government. On the other hand, I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has a little tendency to accuse hon. members of the House of asking foolish, frivolous, questions.

HON. W. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): That is true.

MR. MacLEOD: I think you fared better than you deserved yesterday afternoon. I do not think the questions

directed to you missed the mark.

MR. GRIESINGER: A lot of frivolous questions.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): A lot of questions unanswered, too.

MR. MacLEOD: Would the hon. members of the Opposition concur that the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) was asked foolish questions? I do not think you can be serious.

MR. FROST: Perhaps now we have everything smoothed out and the committee is meeting tomorrow morning and Monday morning in a larger room, and I am putting the Estimates off untill Monday night. Perhaps we can go on with the department of Labour and see if all the questions are answered to the satisfaction of the hon. members.

MR. MacLEOD: I want to say again, the tenor and tone of the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) remarks tonight is simply a build-up for attacking hon. members of the Opposition who may, on Monday want to question the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). That is exactly what it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, a question of privilege.

MR. FROST: Let us hear the question.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I would like to send a note to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) containing the name of the reporter who complained to me this morning.

MR. FROST: All right, go ahead.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Department of Labour.

March 29, 1951.

BB-5

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, I am glad we got that other meeting over, I was hoping to approach this House in spirit of friendliness and I could see if that other meeting kept on there was going to be a lot of animosity around here that might well reflect into my field.

MR. PARK: Never fear.

MR. SALSBERG: No danger.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, in introducing the Estimates of the Department of Labour for the coming year, I am going to present a brief statement regarding my home city because I think that it indicates and makes a point as to what is developing in this province of Ontario. I can recall a few years ago in this House when hon. members were making speeches either on the Speech from the Throne or on the Budget, reference was made to their home communities, and their home riding^s. I must say, as I recall many speeches that I have heard here, I have found that these speeches were not only very interesting, but most educational. They kept the House informed as to what actually was developing in the various parts of the province,, parts that they may not have an opportunity to visit.

Now, this is not very long, but I did secure a few statistics from the city of St. Catharines which is my home city, as to the development that has taken place there in the last few years, namely, from 1943 when I first became an

Member of this legislature. Now, in 1943 in St. Catharines the assessment was \$ 29,330,774 and the tax rate was 32½ mills, and the population was 34,599. In 1951 the assessment is \$39,985,000. I know you are not going to remember all these figures but it will be in Hansard and I

March 29, 1951.

BB-6

think are interesting. The tax rate is $57\frac{1}{2}$ mills and the population is 37,543. In 1943 there were 7,081 dwellings, 279 retail stores. In 1951 there are 8,410 dwellings, and 4,016 retail stores. The bank clearings in 1943 were \$78,250,000. Today the bank clearings are \$159,130,000. Building permits in 1943 were \$33,000.; in 1950 building permits totalled \$3,450,000. There were 99 manufacturing concerns in 1943 employing 11,100 persons and the payroll was \$20 million, an average wage of \$1,820. per year. In 1950 there were 110 manufacturing concerns employing 15,930 persons and the wage paid amounted to \$39,316,000. or the average wage per person was \$2,466.

In addition to that, just outside the city of St. Catharines is Grantham township. The assessment in Grantham was in 1943 \$893,000. and the population was 5,644; there were 3,124 dwellings. In 1951 the Grantham assessment is \$4,723,000. and the population is 12,490; there are 5,600 dwellings.

Now, in addition to that, a new area has been annexed for industrial purposes to the city of St. Catharines and I am advised that nearly all this land has already been taken up for industrial purposes. General Motors are building a big plant that is estimated will cost about \$3,000,000. there. Packard Electric are building a new plant. They already have one in the city but this is a new plant in that neighbourhood of \$1 million. Winters Transport Company are building a huge service place there, and in addition to that the school debentures issued since 1943 in the city of St. Catharines and the area were \$1,221,877./of this annexed land is 13,040 acres.

Now, the general hospital and the Hotel Dieu in

1. 1000

this city are building for 164 new beds--that is the General Hospital--and 24 basinettes. The Hotel Dieu will have 125, both new and old beds when these works are completed.

Now, my purpose in presenting that was not particularly to stress St. Catharines, but to show that in this province there is tremendous industrial development that is taking place.

The report I got from the factory inspection branch, that is the department that examines the plans of all new industrial buildings, shows that the value of approved buildings from April 1st, 1950 to February 28, 1951 had a value of \$103,450,000. new proposed industrial construction. The number of plans approved from 1949 to 1950 were 1,069 and for 1950-51 were 1,440. The value of the buildings in 1949-50 were \$65,000,000. I am just using round figures. In 1950-51, \$115,000,000. Now, as you know, this only represent factory construction or stores and office buildings of more than two stories high so it is indicative of the tremendous industrial development that is taking place in this province which leads one to think that the Department of Labour, because we have a part to play in the industrial development, are continually expanding and finding it necessary to ask for more money for our Estimates. The difficulties we found in conciliation and the settling of disputes has not lessened, due to the fact that for more than a year now--I do not know how much more--but for more than a year we have had the threat or the fear of wage and commodity controls. It has been talked about, it has been in the newspapers, people have been expecting that something

March 29, 1951.

BB-8

along that line was going to happen, and with what result? The workers and industry because of this continual talk of price and wage control got to feeling that this thing was going to happen some day almost out of a clear sky and that the workers are not going to be caught with low wages because they are naturally desirous of having their wages up before a freeze takes place. . The manufacturers and the merchants are equally concerned that they will not be caught with too small a mark-up. We have read today or yesterday where in a great many retail stores, the percentage of profits allowed is going to be fixed and all this, I say, is a lot to contribute to the demands that we are being continually confronted with from the workers and has, I believe, contributed to a large extent^{to} the exceptional profits that are disclosed in the financial statements of various companies. I am not opposed to big profits, I believe in good profits because if a company makes a good profit in a good year, it can stand a lean year. I know I would much rather be working for an industry that was making a good profit because I think the chances are better that a profitable industry will pay good wages and will have good conditions, better than if we have a profit that was scraping the bottom of the barrel. I do not blame labour for endeavouring to get a fair share of the fruits of their efforts.

I think our responsibility as a Department of Labour is two-fold. We have the responsibility of endeavouring to improve the lot of the workers, to eliminate unsafe practices and eliminate hazards, and also to see that industry itself has a chance to carry on and retain initiative so that the great incentive that has built this country and particularly

March 29, 1951.

BB-9

this province of which I speak, shall not be destroyed. Now, from the consumer angle, I think also the fear of possible scarcity that we are continually being told about has encouraged the public to purchase far beyond their actual needs and their desire to buy some commodities has practically eliminated competition. Organization of workers has greatly developed, and I think that will be disclosed later on.

I say again that with this tremendous industrial expansion and development that I do not believe has been exceeded any place I know of, has there been less industrial disruption than we have had right here in this province which would indicate, I think, that our labour laws dealing with labour relations and the various things, under the Department of Labour, must be reasonably sound.

Now, you will notice in the Estimates an item of \$6 million for capital expenditure. Now, one of the boys saw that and said, "Whatever is that \$6 million?". Well, it is really just a book entry because it is payed out for holidays with pay. We sell the stamps to industry and they are placed in the books of the workers and then returned to us.

This \$6 million comes from that. It is interesting that this amount at the beginning was \$375 the first year this Act came into being and it now totals \$6 million and when you figure that it has nothing to do with large industry where they have a fixed method of giving holidays, they do not require stamps, it is only for the stamps that we purchase from the construction industry and for people not of industries, who have ceased to be employed. When these people are changing their employment they are given these

stamps. I thought that was very interesting, that since this Vacations with Pay Act came into being over \$17 million has been paid out to the workers for those vacations.

Now, I say I welcome closer interest of the trade unions in industry. All the inspectors in the world will avail but little if we do not have the co-operation of labour. I might say that yesterday I had a meeting with some of the heads of labour organizations in an endeavour to see what we can develop in a manner that will give labour its proper place in accident-prevention work carried on in this province. I have great faith that the people in this province will continue their co-operation with myself and the officers of my department who help solve many of these difficulties. Experience tells me that, of course, goodwill is a great factor in the development and continuing of good labour relations. It is because of this that I suggest an additional \$62,000. this year will be sufficient to enable us to continue our work in a reasonably satisfactory manner.

I would like to make reference to certain accounts appearing in the public press in which it was stated that a higher status should be given to the Department of Labour and that a much larger budget should be placed at the disposal of the Department. I would like to say, Mr. Chairmna, as long as I have been hon. Minister, I certainly have never considered this Department lacking in importance and I feel confident that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and my colleagues in the government and the hon. members on this side of the House are aware of the importance of the work done by this Department. I have very fine officials, I think anyone who knows the officials in my

March 29, 1951.

BB-11

Department, my deputy and Mr. Louis Fine the chief conciliation officer and his staff are conscientious serious men endeavouring to do a good job in a fair and competent manner. I think I can also safely say that they will continue to do so and if and when more money is required for the operation of this department that it will be available.

Now, I would like to say a word about the amount of money voted to carry out the functions of the department. I need only go back to March, 31, 1947 when the total Budget was \$437,000. and for the year 1951-52 the Budget is \$1,130,000., an increase of \$63,000. this year. It has been a gradual increase, because as I say, the industrial activity, the increasing volume of it throughout the province requires more service and greater demands on the Department of Labour as it does on other departments. I can say without fear of contradiction that since I have been hon. Minister that the continuing increasing of demands on the government, we have never been refused, and I can also say that I have, with one exception, when there was about \$20,000. that each Budget has been employed for our means and we have not requested a lot of money we do not require.

MR. WISMER: Do you think the means were ample?

MR. DALEY: I think so, if I did not I would certainly request more. The department is continuing to expand and I can say that I do not think the end of its expansion is in sight. I realize we have not reached the acme of perfection. The population is growing and our industries are growing. I do not agree with a lot of people who seem to think that any time, lean times may hit this province and this country, ^{but} I cannot visualize that for a number of years.

March 29, 1951.

BB-12

It seems to me the time of growth is here and will be for a considerable length of time.

I think our schools and our educational system has improved to a greater extent and while probably not perfect yet, has been placed within the reach of the young people coming on who have faith and confidence in this country to develop and receive a fine education and fit them for their activities as good citizens.

I think a great many of the hon. members in this Assembly, as I look around, started if not quite as humbly as myself, perhaps almost as humbly, to go to work at an early age and I think I can realize possibly more than people who were not in that position the value of a good education for our youth. I hope they appreciate that and avail themselves of it and we do all in our power to see that it is available to them but I still believe there is no substitute for hard work and initiative to achieve success and happiness. It is a very fine thing and it is something that I absolutely believe in to make provision for some unfortunates who have some reason beyond their control, become so that is impossible for them to look after themselves. That is a great obligation which we have.

(TAKE "CC" FOLLOWS)

That is a great obligation that we have. But I also thank that by providing opportunity educationally, and making the facilities available to our people, they should put something in, there must be work and initiative and a desire to progress. Our forefathers worked hard and with great ability to make this an agricultural province and in our time it has changed, not completely, because we are still a great agricultural province, but we are now a great industrial province which opens up greater fields for our sons and our daughters and the young people coming into this province.

The Fair Employment Practices Act of 1951 and the Female Employees Fair Remuneration Act, 1951, which will be administered in a new branch of the Department, will mean an expenditure for additional staff and equipment. At this juncture it is impossible to say just how much money will be required, so we did not place it in the estimates, because there is no experience, there has been nothing established on which to found an Estimate. However, the one Act does not come into force until January, 1952 and The Fair Employment Practices Act will be operated for less than a whole fiscal year. It is my thought that we will start it, as I have already suggested, with a Director, a man already in the Department, and add staff as it becomes necessary.

I assume many hon. members are familiar with industrial relations and will realize that the conciliation services have done a reasonably good job in this province. You will appreciate just how good a job was done when I tell you that six men -- and that is, what we have, Mr. Fine and five assistants -- have dealt with over 500 disputes during the year. In more than 60 per cent of these

March 29, 1951.

CC-2

cases, they settled the disputes, and most of the balance were of course referred to boards of conciliation. Any number of persons have presumed to criticize the operation of The Labour Relations Act, and the procedures established thereunder for settling disputes and effecting conciliation agreements. Of course, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the figures I gave you will show that a reasonably good job is being done, as we have had not more, I do not think, than a half a dozen strikes, after hundreds of matters have been referred to conciliation. That, is the real test.

There is another branch of the Department, about which I desire to say something, and that is the Apprenticeship Branch. In my opinion, there is no more worthwhile activity carried on in the Department of Labour than the Apprenticeship training programme given by the Department of Labour. Under the Apprenticeship Act, certain trades are designated to which apprenticeship training is compulsory, and an employer who takes any lad between the ages of 16 and 21 years must enter into a contract of apprenticeship if he retains him for a period of longer than 90 days. Almost all the building trades are designated, as well as the motor vehicle repair trade. In the next fiscal year we shall offer a course of instruction lasting on the average of 9 weeks to approximately 1350 apprentices, at a cost of \$349,000., which will be borne by the Ontario and the Dominion government. The Dominion government shares on a 50-50 basis.

In the Speech from the Throne, it was stated that a new school would be built to house the classes in apprenticeship training. This will be very welcome news to all who

Mar. 29, 1951.

CC-3

share my great interest in apprenticeship. We must never forget that it is only through an organized system of apprenticeship that we can preserve the skills so vital to a provincial economy. I sincerely hope that this new school, -- and I know I am a little fearful with the restriction on steel and the other materials that it will possibly have to be delayed -- but nothing would please me more than to have a part in developing a new trade school where ^{the} / young men desirous of entering a trade would be given fine technical instruction, because I think -- and I may possibly be wrong in this -- there is great opportunity in this growing country for tradesmen. I believe there is as fine an opportunity for tradesmen to develop and become skilled mechanics and go on into becoming contractors as there is in many of the professions, and I think there is a lot of fine boys in this country who would do well to consider entering a trade, even at a lower rate of pay for the first few years. I know when I learned my trade as a carpenter, I got \$3. a week for the first year, \$4. for the second, and \$5. the third, and it was pretty tough, even in those days, getting along on that. Mechanics wages are certainly not what they can get now in industry, but in the long run, in the long pull, I believe a young man today would be well-advised to consider entering a trade, where there is good employment and gainful employment.

In our examination of plans, I pointed out the tremendous development there, 103 million or so, this last year we had to put two new men on there, two engineers, just to examine these plans and approve of them or suggest improvements that would meet the requirements of The Factory, Shop

and Office Building Act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have touched on some of the branches of the Department and said something of their activities. No one realizes any better than myself that the volume of the work in the department is increasing. I am aware that such increased activities will mean an increase in staff, but there is one thing more than anything else which I accept as a fact, and that is in the particular skills required in our department, except for the routine office work, it requires people with special knowledge and special skill, and it is just not too easy to find these people, particularly for conciliation work. It is very difficult to find men who have that certain something that is required to make good conciliation officers.

I am prepared to expand the staff of the Department as our future needs dictate, but I am certainly not prepared to rush in and require a whole lot of money and build up a staff without having a definite job and a purpose for each one of them to do.

I want to assure hon. members of the committee that more conciliation officers, factory inspectors, boiler inspectors, apprenticeship inspectors, and other staffs will be taken on our staff as quickly as we can get competent people and have a job for them to do. In any event, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Estimates which I have presented to the House for approval will meet the demands of the Department for this year, with the exception of the operation of The Fair Employment Practices and Fair Remuneration for Female Employees, and that money, if required, will be found elsewhere.

March 29, 1951.

CC-5

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, on this Main Office budget, I would like to make one or two observations. I would first of all like to say that I think the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) staff does an excellent job, by and large. I sometimes think that this Legislature fails to give them the weapons by which they should do that job better, but I think that within the scope of the legislation, they are doing a very, very good job indeed, and I would like to echo the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) commendation of the conciliation service of the Department of Labour. I think Mr. Fine's efforts, and those of his associates, are serving the people of this province in the very best way. Certainly I regard Louis Fine as one of the ace conciliation officers in the Dominion of Canada, I do not think that you could go from one end to the other and find a man more qualified than he is, or better able to handle the job that he performs. And I think that his staff, under his direction is doing the best job that they can do.

But again, the problem that we face with the Department of Labour is this, I think, that the expansion of the Department itself has not kept pace with the expansion of the work the Department ought to be undertaking. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) in his remarks made a reference to the tremendous increase in the city of St. Catharines. That tremendous growth in St. Catharines today is repeated in community after community across this province and indeed in the province as a whole.

MR. DALEY: It is?

MR. PARK: And as the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) well knows, has created new and different problems for his

CC-6

Department and has put a heavier burden of work on him and the people that work in the Department of Labour.

Now, I was very interested in the references that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) made to the amount of money available for the Department of Labour in 1937 as compared with the amount of money asked for in the Estimate that is before us today, or was available in 1951. I am sorry that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) did not give us the amount of money that was available for the Department of Labour in 1943, because you may recall the speech made by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) on the expenditures that were being made by the various departments, and how they had added up in actual services they were rendering to the people of the province. What is the per capita expenditure today? In terms of what that 57¢ dollar will buy, what is the per capita expenditure that we are making in the labour field in the province of Ontario? And the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) has put on Hansard this record, that is for 1943, the year ending March 31st, 1943, that the expenditure in terms of 1939 dollars represented 15 cents per capita. In 1951, the year just coming to a close now, March 31, 1951, the per capita expenditure in the field of labour in terms of 1939 dollars was 14 cents. So, there has been, actually, in terms of the service that those dollars will produce, less money being spent in the Department of Labour, or there is less service available in the Department of Labour per capita than there was in 1943, when the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) took over, taking into account the tremendous inflationary period that we are in, and the way that has reduced the value of the dollars that you are asking us to vote you here this evening.

(TAKE "DD" FOLLOWS)

March 29th, 1951.

DD-1

So, in spite of the fact that there has been a very great industrial expansion, which the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has mentioned, I suggest in all seriousness that the services which are available from our Department of Labour have not kept pace with that expansion, and if there is any criticism which should be levelled at the Department of Labour, it is that criticism. We really have not ventured into very many new fields to keep pace with the changing and growing industrial situation in the province of Ontario. We still do not, for example, have from the Department of Labour anything near the service material which is available from the Department of Agriculture for the farmers of this province. I said it in 1949. I repeated it in 1950, and I come back to it again in 1951. We are not producing for the industrial workers of this province, information which will be of use to them such as the Department of Agriculture produces for the farmers which is of use to them.

MR. DALEY: I do not think that is a very fair comparison.

MR. PARK: The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) does not publish a regular document or a regular bulletin of any kind from his Department, other than the annual statement. A few weeks ago, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) started to issue regular Press statements. Prior to that time there have been no regular publications coming from the Department of Labour keeping track of trends in industrial relations in this province, keeping track of changed working conditions, keeping track of changed union agreements and that sort of thing, which service the

Department of Labour ought to be performing, and which a great many departments of Labour on this continent are performing for the workers in their areas.

A year ago the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) may remember I suggested that some such undertaking ought to be considered. He said he would give it some consideration. It is true that some of the conciliation reports from the Ontario Department of Labour find their way into the Federal Labour Gazette, and to that extent, are available to the general public, but there is no regular publication coming from the Ontario Department of Labour to the workers of this province in the most industrialized, and I think, the most important industrial province in the Dominion of Canada.

Look at the estimate for this year. Again, coming back to this fabulous estimate which runs into the Department of Labour each and every year, I call the attention of the hon. members to Vote 95, Item 8:

"Advertising:

Publicity, Library Publications, Journals, Periodicals, Subscriptions, Membership Fees and News, Educational Work, Conferences, Speakers, Exhibitions, General Investigations, Legal Services, Administration of Justice, Litigation of Constitutional Questions and Other Matters, Witnesses and Interpreters, Other Legislation administered by the Department of Labour -- "

MR. SALSBERG: "Et cetera".

MR. PARK: Yes; "et cetera".

March 29th, 1951.

DD-3

MR. DALEY: I am glad they did not leave the "et cetera" out, too.

MR. PARK: That will cover the Fair Employment Practices division for you, Mr. Minister (Mr. Daley), since you have not covered it in any other part of the Estimates.

MR. DALEY: Of course, that does sound kind of bad, but you must realize that is merely to keep that account open. Few, if any, of those things, do we ever have a call for, but we might, and it has been felt that there should be an open account there. I could cross out about three-quarters of those if that would accomplish any purpose, but we do run into the odd little expense, for which we are supposed to have money.

We try to build an estimate, and that is why I think that the Treasurer has never cut us down or objected to our estimates, because we hit them right on the beam for what we want. Of course, last year we were confronted with the cost of the Roach Report, which was paid out of that estimate. Otherwise, we would have spent very little of it.

MR. PARK; May I suggest that I think that is the kind of estimate which should be made if it is necessary, but keep an account open for such matters as legal services, administration of justice, litigation on constitutional questions, and other matters. Let us have that separated, at least, from publicity and library publications. There is no conceivable reason why those two things should be in the same vote.

I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) would agree

DD-4

that when we vote Item 8, we ought to be voting for advertising and publicity. That is the item on which I was going to speak. That item is not greatly different. Last year the same item was \$11,000. In 1950 to 1951 you did isolate the litigation of constitutional and other questions, because in 1950 - 51, estimates, you put \$5.00 in the estimates for the litigation of constitutional questions, and now you have taken it back into the general advertising one.

MR. DALEY: You did not like it the way it was, so I changed it. What more could I do?

MR. PARK: I think what you should do is divide advertising from the other ones, so we can discuss advertising as a separate part.

There is one question about which I would like to speak to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) quite seriously for a few moments. He mentioned the question of apprenticeship and so on. I want to raise the question of the workers who find themselves without jobs and that they have not the necessary training to enter another job. It happens usually with workers over the forty-year mark. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) knows this to be a pretty serious problem at times. There are all sorts of reasons why industry is hesitant to take on workers over forty or forty-five years of age. It has become a special problem, because I think, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) knows, the Federal Department of Labour and the Department of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), have had to concern themselves about the question on a great many occasions.

, In the growing understanding which has been developing between the Ontario Government and the Government at Ottawa, this is one field where that understanding has not yet produced results and where it could produce results merely by this government agreeing to implement an agreement it made with the Federal Government some time ago. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) may know about Schedule (f) which is part of the Vocational Training Co-ordination Act of 1942. Under that Act the Federal Government undertakes to subsidize vocational training in those provinces which enter into agreement with it to provide such training under the various schedules of the Act. The Act contemplates training of various classes of people such as youths, unemployed, veterans, apprentices, as well as assistance to vocational schools and to universities. I understand all the provinces have signed an agreement with the Federal Government under the Act. That is the information I have. Ontario is among the provinces which has signed an agreement but so far it has not implemented it. Schedule (m) of the Act pertains to the training or retraining of workers who have become unemployed in the primary and secondary industries of the province. This would include just about anyone in the province who works for a living. The training courses which are made available to such unemployed people vary in number from province to province, but there is a considerable number of these courses, both for men and women, including skilled trades as we understand the term, and others. By not implementing the agreement, Ontario has failed to set up training classes

March 29th, 1951.

DD-6

under Schedule (m). The net result is that unemployed workers in Ontario are not available to secure training or retraining facilities, which would be available to them if they happened to be residents of other provinces. These training classes are free under the Act which we have failed to implement. In addition, some of the provinces make allowances available to these trainees.

Under the Unemployment Insurance Act, the Commission may direct an employed person to a course of training and pay benefits while the course is being taken.

This matter first came to my attention, as a matter of fact, during a conversation I had with one of the persons who is on the Advisory Committee of the Unemployment Insurance Commission for the Ontario region. He represents labour on that Advisory Committee. He was discussing with me the feeling of the Unemployment Insurance Commission in the Province of Ontario that this schedule, which is already part of an agreement into which this province has entered

(PAGE DD-7 FOLLOWS)

THE JOURNAL OF THE
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.
Subscription price, Five Dollars per Annum in Advance.
Single Copies, Fifteen Cents.
Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 2, 1896.
Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., May 2, 1896.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917.
Copyright, 1900, by American Medical Association.
Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 2, 1896.
Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., May 2, 1896.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917.
Copyright, 1900, by American Medical Association.
Published by the American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

DD - 7

should be implemented and implemented quickly so that unemployed person, particularly those in the over forty age group, could be retrained and jobs found for them. The unemployment Insurance Commission makes allowance for workers under that particular schedule, a schedule of which we can take advantage any time we want, and under which the Federal Government makes money available for those retraining projects. I suggest that obviously this is something the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) ought to look into, because, while it is true that we have not got anything like the unemployment we had a year ago, for which we are all very thankful, though we are not too happy about the deteriorating international situation which has brought an end to that unemployment situation, but, where there is a problem of workers being unemployed, I think the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) will agree it is frequently among those people in the above forty years of age class who find it difficult to be placed in industry and where facilities for retraining are not readily available. I would suggest to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that he --

MR. DALEY : Could you show me a case --

MR. PARK: --- ask the Unemployment Insurance Advisory Committee for the Ontario region to discuss the matter with him. I think he will find that it is not only the views of the labour people but of the people who are responsible for the administration of the Act, and it is the view of those who represent employers on the Advisory Committee as well as it is the view of the labour people that Schedule (m) ought

to be implemented in the Province of Ontario. It is available to us under the Vocational Training Co-ordination Act of 1942.

One advantage of having these courses together with Unemployment Insurance is that a claimant for benefit who is taking such a course will not be referred to other employment during his period of training. He is thus free to devote himself to learning his new occupation. In Ontario this is not the case. A claimant who would like to be retrained, is not only lacking in the facilities, but will ordinarily find himself referred to other employment in which he may not be interested, which may be a blind-alley job, or which may not be suitable in other respects. What this boils down to, is that Ontario is not showing the same consideration for those of its citizens who are wage earners as other Provinces. Since Ontario is the most highly industrialized Province in Canada, this negligence is all the more to be condemned.

MR. DALEY: Could the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) give me an illustration of a man working in an industry, who reaches the age of 45 or 50? He is the fellow of whom you are thinking. He becomes unemployed. What would you want him retrained in -- as a painter or something of that sort?

MR. PARK: The retraining would be done on the basis of what jobs are opening, where the most likely possibilities are for getting jobs, and where his aptitude fits. At the moment I would suggest that a man of 40 or 45, becoming unemployed and needing retraining,

March 29th, 1951

DD - 9

might be treated as follows. One of the very obvious places where he could find a job, if he had any sort of training or elementary knowledge of airplane manufacturing would be in that industry. It would be a very useful talent for him in finding a job at the present time. That is one example where you have a growing employment situation. As the employment shifts, there will be other industries with that situation developing. The fact of the matter is that here is a service which ought to be available to workers, particularly the group above forty and forty-five years of age. We are not taking advantage of it because we have failed to implement an agreement which we signed subsequent to the passing of The Vocational Training Co-ordination Act of 1942. I bring that matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). If nothing more happens, or comes out of these estimates than that the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) takes action on Schedule (m), we will have accomplished a great deal this evening.

I do not think I am going to get very far on any of the other points, so I will not spend too much time on them. I would like to make this point, in passing. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) made mention of a meeting which was held yesterday morning with some of the trade unionists on the question of the development of accident prevention in industry. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) was kind enough to suggest that I should attend that meeting. I had the opportunity of meeting with the union people and the

March 29th, 1951.

DD - 10

officials of the Workmen's Compensation Board, and the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), and I think that the prospects coming out of that meeting are very good. I am hopeful that a year from now we will have developed much superior safety precaution system than exists at the presenttime; and, to the extent that the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has shown he has an open mind on this question, and that he is ready to give consideration to any proposals that are made. I think he is to be complimented.

(TAKE "EE" FOLLOWS)

EE-1

and I think that these prospects coming out of that meeting were very good, and I am hopeful that a year from now we will have developed a much superior safety precaution system than exist at the present time, and to the extent that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has shown he has an open mind on these questions, and is ready to give consideration to any proposals which are made, I think he is to be complimented. I do hope, however, that I can get some action from him on schedule "M".

MR. DALEY: I will certainly look into it.

MR. L.F.K. FELL (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this vote. I had intended, as a matter of fact, to wait a little longer, but I rise as a result of some of the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley), and particularly on one point which I have in mind.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has said that he has the most efficient staff. The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) endorsed that remark tonight. From the experience I have had with the Department, particularly with the Conciliation staff, I wish to re-endorse that statement, and say that the staff is composed of very excellent people. The unfortunate thing is, as has also been said by the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) they do not have enough of them, and I was struck by the remark by the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) that there was an intention on the part of the Department of Labor to enlarge their staff --

MR. DALEY: May I just interrupt for a moment? You say we have not enough of them. You will admit that

29th March

EE-2

just within the last week or so you found yourself in a little difficulty, and within a day, we had consulted about the matter, and on the same day, we cleaned up the trouble.

MR. FELL: That is right, and if you will give me a chance to say something, I will mention that, and perhaps pay you another compliment.

I want to say it is the considered opinion not only of organized labor, but by the hon. members of this Legislature, that the staff is an excellent one, and is one which is not only prepared, but anxious to give us all the services they possibly can. That they have been very successful is indicated by a further statement by the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) in an answer I placed before the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) earlier in this Session. We think the staff is an excellent one, but I must repeat there is not enough of them, and we have evidence to substantiate that. Perhaps, if we had more of these people, and the people of the new staff were made available to us at an earlier time, we would not get into a situation such as was referred to, an emergency situation, where the individuals in the Department actually put themselves out to help solve the problems, and when we have the people available, where these situations arise, we can get down to business, and arrive at some decision, before the matter becomes critical.

Let me give you an example. I say the people on the staff there are overtaxed, and as the result many of these situations which require the services, for instance, of the Conciliation staff, cannot be met immediately.

I do not want to weary the House, but I have almost 25 or 30 examples on file, and many more have been presented

EE-3

to the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley), I believe.

I just want to show you by way of example what the situation can be. Here is what I consider an excellent case. This is the case where the Department has given us ^{the} best service it can, and this is what happened. I will submit the name of the company and the Union involved, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) wishes, but this is where the Union began negotiations on August 24th, 1950. By December they still had not reached a settlement with the company. In December, the company and the Union mutually agreed to apply for conciliation assistance. A conciliation officer was applied for, and he came in on December 6th. No agreement was reached, and they both agreed to apply for a Board, and application was made, and the company's nominee and the Union's nominee were appointed on the 12th of February. From December to February, that is pretty good service. Within two months from the time the conciliation officer came in, but six months after they began to negotiate.

MR. DALEY: You cannot blame us for the delay in the negotiations?

MR. FELL: No, but I think it is a good case to show what good service we can get at times from the Department, and they have given us the best service they possibly can.

On December 6th, the Conciliation officer came in. No settlement was effected, and the Conciliation officer suggested we make application for a Board, and he made a recommendation to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), in turn, agreed to appoint a Chairman.

On February 19th, both parties agreed

EE-4

to a Board. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) appointed the Chairman on the 26th of February. The first meeting was held on March 9th; the second meeting was held on March 21st, and at this particular moment, a report still has not been written, but the point I want to make is this is a good case to indicate how fast the situation can move, when you have people available immediately. December, January, February, and into March, so we should have a report any time now. We think that is a record. We think in the labor movement this is almost a record for getting conciliation set up, and perhaps getting a report. Now, contrast that situation with this one. Here is a situation where the Union involved was not able to get service as rapidly as they would have liked. Here is a case where the Union and company began negotiations in July of last year. They negotiated from July to October; no settlement. A Conciliation officer was applied for, and came in, in October, and they only reached a settlement in February. There are July, August, September, October, November, December, January and February; seven months before they got a settlement.

MR. DALEY: That was a Board.

MR. FELL: Yes, and add on to that the period of time the negotiations were being carried on, and you have extended the period almost to nine months.

MR. DALEY: When I appoint⁸ Chairmen, they are gone away from me.

MR. FELL: All right, but you must still have something to say about the Board which you appoint. You must have some authority to say that a report should be received, and a settlement made faster than that. I want to get this point across, that it takes so long to get a settlement,

The first thing I noticed when I stepped
 out of the car was the cold. It was a
 sharp contrast to the warm blanket of
 the car. I shivered slightly, but then I
 remembered that this was the first time
 I had ever been to this place. I had
 heard so much about it, but now that I
 was here, it felt like a dream. The
 streets were wide and clean, and the
 buildings were tall and modern. I
 had never seen anything like this before.
 I walked down the street, looking at
 the people and the cars. They all seemed
 so different from the people and cars I
 knew back home. I felt like I had
 entered a new world. I was so curious
 about everything. I wanted to see
 everything, to feel everything. I was
 so happy. I had finally made it.
 I had come to the place I had always
 dreamed of. I was here. I was
 home.

EE-5

that the relationship between the employer and the collective bargaining unit worsens. The real problem which seems to be coming forward is this; after perhaps going nine months, a settlement is reached, but there is no retroactivity in the settlement, or if there is any, it is only retroactive for a short period of time. Let us see how unjust this is. When the Union submitted its request to the company in the first place, maybe nine months ago, their demands were based on the economic problem at that time, the cost of living, and things like that, and the wages which were going in that particular industry at that time. All these things were taken into consideration, when the Union drafted its proposals to the company. Nine months later, what happened? The cost of living had risen sky high, and the original demands of the Union were completely worthless. Even if they got what they asked for, it would be inadequate, yet they were forced to conciliation and subject to a decision based on demands made nine months previously, and I have here an extract from a Memorandum of proposals by the Ontario Federation of Labour, where they point out:

" Another matter which has caused concern among our Federation affiliates is the delay in processing conciliation matters. Our convention went on record saying that instead of waiting 50 days before you can apply for conciliation, a party should be able to apply after 15 days where, in the opinion of the party, no agreement can be reached without conciliation.

Last year the Ontario Federation of Labour suggested, as an alternative to the present expensive conciliation board set up, that the final step in conciliation proceedings be the conciliation officer. He shall be clothed with the authority to hear the case, and if possible, effect a settlement, and failing that, to make a conciliation report of what he considers fair and equitable. That report would carry the same weight as a conciliation board report. In this way conciliation proceedings would be speeded up tremendously; the question of neutral chairmen would be solved, and your conciliation officers would perform a useful function rather than as they are now -- a mere cog in the process."

Mr. Chairman, I submit that in many cases that is precisely what the purpose of the conciliation man has been, to cut another piece of red tape out of the way. He comes in, and only has a limited period of time, and has to go to another place the next day, or the same day, perhaps, and maybe has to go to a place some fifty, or sixty, or a hundred miles away. He calls on the company, and talks to them, says "Where do you stand? How far are you prepared to go", and then he talks to the Union, and says "How far are you prepared to come down". If it is apparent neither party will agree to a settlement, then he recommends a Conciliation Board. He simply puts on his hat and leaves.

We would like to have the Conciliation officer stay on the job, and not have to run around the country to

29th March

EE-7

another case the same day. May I make this suggestion to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley)? I want the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), first of all to get one point clear, that it is still the opinion of the Canadian Congress of Labour, The Federation of Labour, and I believe the A.F. of L. Group that the staff is not large enough.

(TAKE "FF" FOLLOWS)

March 29th, 1951

FF - 1

We think that there is a shortage of staff; and the need is now, not in the future. The need will grow. We have a need right now that should be filled.

Let me propose this to the Minister and he may say, "Suppose I enlarge my conciliations now, by putting on another ten or fifteen men. Are you suggesting that those men are going to be completely occupied from one end of the year to the other?" No, I do not, because I believe it is a fact that there are period throughout the year when the present staff are not completely occupied, when men are available whom there is no situation to meet. But, we all know, too that at certain periods of the year, of recent years, the services of the conciliation staff are required more than at any other time of the year, and cannot always be available at the precise time when a settlement might be arranged without too much difficulty. So in answer to that problem I would propose this to the Minister. I appreciate that the kind of men who make good conciliation officers are not easy to get. I do not think that necessary means that it is impossible to get suitable men. There are a good many men throughout this Province who would be available to the Minister if he went out to seek them. I say to him, put on a reasonable number in addition to the present staff. At times when the conciliation staff is usually over-taxed, these men will be available to go into a situation before it reaches the point where a strike is inevitable. Thus, you would get your problem straightened out without eight or nine months delay. When the period comes around

that there is not much conciliation work to be done, these men, I suggest, would be quite capable of performing duties as factory inspectors. At least many of them would. At the present time, with probably only forty inspectors to inspect about 40,000 plants in this Province, it is obvious that these inspectors are over-taxed. Let us employ conciliation officers when they are not otherwise busy on factory inspection or other work on behalf of the department. Then, when, in the cycle of events, the situation again arises that conciliation officers are needed, you have them on your staff and you do not have to go looking for them; they are merely transferred to the conciliation branch. I make that as a recommendation.

Further, I would endorse the recommendation of the Ontario Federation of Labour that the conciliation officer be made "the final word". I would go even further. If the Minister is not prepared to accept the conciliation officer's recommendation as final, let there be some set-up of this kind. The conciliation officer could become the last word to a point; in other words, if labour-management has not been able to reach an agreement, and makes application, and get a conciliation officer, and he comes in and tries to effect a settlement, and at the end of his investigation says, "This is what I recommend; this is what you employers should give the Union, and this is what the Union should accept", if there is still disagreement, the Union should be allowed to take a strike vote.

But if the Company still feels that

March 29th, 1951.

FF - 3

more could be done, they could appeal to a conciliation board. I believe that is a course which would eliminate the problem. But note what is happening. I am not in agreement with people who make such irresponsible statements as that which I read in the Press, that, if this situation follows, the Labour Leaders are no longer responsible for the action of their membership. That is a lot of nonsense. Let these critics go in a factory and work under the conditions that our people are working under, economically. Let them listen to the arguments our people put up to their representatives on the subject of cost of living in comparison with take-home pay. Let these "dough-heads" go in and find out what the situation is. You cannot push superior nonsense of that kind down the throats of the workers to-day. They are human beings -- with a basic education and some knowledge of the fundamental ethics which affect their situation. So it is nonsense to throw out these snide remarks about what Labour Leaders are saying.

HON. MR. FROST: Are you referring by those remarks to the Department of Labour?

MR. FELL: No, I did not say the Department of Labour made this remark. That was from an editorial a few days ago in one of our newspapers.

MR. FROST: Have we not got all this unloaded by now, so we can get ahead?

MR. FELL: No; and I disagree with what the Prime Minister said on three different occasions, that there was nothing more to be said about labour. I have

sat here, through this time, keeping my mouth shut.

MR. FROST: Don't tell me!

MR. THOMAS: ^(Elgin) The door is always open to tell him.

MR. FELL: The ~~worker~~ in the factory, with the problems he has got to face to-day, cannot but be affected by the psychological reaction of such things as his wages not being in line with his cost of living, and when he comes to a point where he cannot ^{get} a settlement with his employer through collective bargaining, he says, what is the next step? The next step is conciliation. What happens there? Under the Act, the Company has fifty days for negotiation, even if they do not do anything. I say that both the Union and the Company know within fourteen days after they start to negotiate whether they are going to reach a settlement. So you start conciliation, and under the Act the Company has the right to hold you to certain steps, which makes it possible for the sort of thing that I have brought to the attention of the Minister a short time ago,-- these long drawn out delays in arriving at a settlement. So the worker cannot be blamed if he says: "Do you mean to tell me I have got to wait nine months to get a settlement?" Look at the figures to-day of the cost of living index, which appears in the paper almost every night; turn to the financial page, and you have got your price index, which indicates how the cost of living is jumping. Nine months hence, when you get your settlement on a demand made to-day, or five or ~~six~~ weeks ago, even if you obtain the maximum demanded, it will still fall short of

FF - 5

what the situation requires at that time. Can you blame the worker for saying, "No, Sir, I am not going to wait nine or ten months. I must have a settlement now." So if one finds a dislocation in production and in business, it must be appreciated that the worker, under the pressure he has to meet, has come to the conclusion that there is no other way that it can be met. To say that the workers are completely unreasonable and that the bosses are a bunch of grand fellows is not, I submit, reasonable. What do you think of the employer who, when the worker suggests, "Alright, tie the whole wage question to the cost of living.", says "No, it is going to cost me too much money", Can you blame the employees for wanting to close him up? For that is the only language he seems to understand. There is a solution, and it is the solution we have proposed. Give the conciliation officer the authority to do as was suggested by the Labour groups. Give him the authority to stay in there. Give him first of all, enough staff to have a man stay in there and say, "This is what I recommend"; and then, if it is going to be an economic fight, let it be an economic fight, and if there is to be a Board of Appeal, let it be a conciliation board . to which either party can appeal. Do not take away the right of Labour to protect itself in the way we have suggested.

Much has been said about what a "wonderful" Act we have. I do not mind saying that in many respects it is as fine a piece of legislation as can be found anywhere. But where we find loopholes, where

March 29th, 1951.

FF -6

there is a situation which can be corrected, not merely by changing legislation but by a change of policies which are, in effect, Labour Department and in the conciliation branch -- something that can be done without any difficulty at all -- I think that we at this legislature would be remiss and the Minister of Labour will be remiss if he does not seize the opportunity to do it.

That is a point I want to make clear, because, as the Minister knows, I personally was involved last year in a situation -- or situations -- where this problem had to be faced. It just is not a question of going up to the working man and saying, "Look, Brother, it is too bad; I feel sorry for you; everything you say is right, but you must abide by this legislation. We know that the Company is utilizing it to stall you off, so that when you get a settlement, nine months hence, it is only going to be about half what you need." The award is not always retroactive to the day negotiations began; in most cases, it is only as of the date when conciliation is applied for or granted by the Ministry of Labour, so the man is very likely losing the difference in his wages for a period of anywhere from five to eight months.

I would close ^{with} / the remark that the Minister should not consider this as a question of legislation on which a back ~~bencher~~ is talking to a cabinet minister, or vice versa. I feel that what I say is reasonable, and I believe that the Minister of Labour is a man big enough to appreciate that. If what he says is true -- and I believe it is true -- that he came out of the

factory himself, he must realise what I have said about the attitude of the workers to-day -- which you are not going to change with legislation -- is a fact. Realising and accepting that it is a fact, I am sure he is going to make some of the changes that have been suggested.

MR. DALEY: I would like to reply just briefly. I do not doubt for a moment that the hon. member is sincere, that he believes what he says, and is convinced that what he suggests would be an improvement. The difference between us is that I do not agree with him. In the first place, our conciliation services have, as the results I outlined earlier in my address prove, produced wonderful results. In a whole year, in this great industrial Province, with hundreds of applications for conciliation, there have been only about five strikes.

I would like to say that we never draw a conciliator off one job until he is finished. When he leaves a dispute, he is through. He has decided "I can't settle this thing". He comes to me and says "I can't do any more in there now; you will have to appoint a Board." Well, to appoint a Board is not so

easy and sometimes cannot be accomplished just as quickly as we would like. Sometimes it is very difficult to find a chairman. Especially in certain seasons of the year, judges are all tied up, or are going on their holidays; and sometimes, we will call one morning as many as half a dozen to try to coax one of them to take these jobs. The thing is to be realistic. The basic principle of this Act under which we operate, is that there will be, first, conciliation;

March 29th, 1951.

FF - 8

then, a period during which a Board can be appointed; a representative of the industry, of the employees, and an independent and impartial chairman appointed by the Minister, if the parties cannot agree on one. There are delays, and those delays occur for many reasons. I could cite you as many cases in which the delay has been caused by the Union representative, as I could those caused by the employer. I have had it happen that the Union representative said, "Look, I am going to be on my holidays for the next three weeks, I won't be able to meet them until after that." Then, maybe, when this fellow gets back, the Judge cannot attend. So that to get a Board appointed in the first place and then find a time when they can meet, sometimes causes considerable delay. In the case of some delays -- not all -- the Unions are not without some responsibility. But I think you have picked out about the worst case you could find in a great many when you mention a delay of nine months. As I see it, the thing is that during all this time, the men are working, they are not on the street, they are getting a pay check every saturday night, and if and when the time comes that the dispute can be settled, they have not lost a thing. But if we make it ever so easy, appoint a conciliation officer, and the adjuster goes in and says, "I am sorry, I can't do anything for you people, but you have the right to go on strike within a few days", I am afraid we would have ten times the strikes we have now; the people would suffer; no-one would gain. Once a plant closes down, everybody starts to lose, and the biggest losers are probably the

March 29th, 1951.

FF - 9

workers. That is what we try to avoid. That is what we feel our obligation is; and sometimes, if there is a little too long delay, I just feel sorry about the delay, but I feel very glad that the men continue at work, and eventually we can settle a dispute and in most cases -- my friend says, in few cases, but I say, in most cases -- there is a retroactive feature which takes care of the time occupied in negotiations.

MR. FELL: That is not quite true.

MR. DALEY: So I would be very hesitant to change a system that does work.

MR. FELL: It keeps men at work, but it does not make a legitimate adjustment in wages considering the delay that has taken place. If the Minister's aim is simply to keep men at work, he is succeeding, but if the aim of the Department of Labour is to see that the workers get justice and a reasonable settlement in this situation, he has got to go further. Where does he find justice in saying, "Alright; we kept them at work; they should be satisfied; they are getting their wages which they complained were unsatisfactory in the first place."

MR. DALEY: I am not saying that. I say they are working.

MR. FELL: They are getting the wages which are unsatisfactory. They apply for more. You say it is reasonable that, when the conciliation board's decision comes down, it should be based entirely on their original demand, which was made long ago, at a time when a settlement of the dispute on that basis might have been reasonable, but now is completely un-

March 29th, 1951.

FF - 10

reasonable. If the purpose of the Department of Labour is to keep men at work, I think the Minister will succeed with the Act he has. But if the purpose of the Department is to see that justice is done, that the employees problems are recognized -- and don't forget it is the employers who have got the apples and not the employees -- and the employees shall get a reasonable adjustment and just treatment, then it has got to make other changes which are not now being made. All I can gather from the Minister's remarks is that the primary object is to keep the men at work under any circumstances, and no settlement is to be made on anything but their original demands.

(TAKE GG FOLLOWS)

March 29, 1951

GG-1

MR. DALEY: I didn't say anything about the original demand.

MR. FELL: That is the only thing I can make out of your remarks.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief remarks, which can be justified on the basis of the Vote before us, leaving the details to later Votes which will come up. Before making the brief remarks, however, I want to plead with the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to accept these remarks as constructive criticism, that merits serious consideration, and not to conclude that they are directed at him personally or at anyone in his Department.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) in his introduction said, I think very correctly, that the Province of Ontario has undergone a profound change in recent times, that it has become a great industrial province and it is no longer chiefly an agricultural province. That is something that I fear this government has not fully grasped as yet. I think that while the industrial advances have been colossal, and we are now in an atomic age and in a period of jet planes, there is a hang-over of the "horse-and-buggy" days insofar as the Labour Department and the thinking of the government on labour problems. It could be proven by many instances. The best, perhaps, is the nature of the so-called criticism that comes from labour members of the House in considering the Estimates annually, and I am glad that the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) is here, and I know he will listen ^{at least} with one ear, and I think he can make a contribution towards the improvement that is long overdue.

What is the essence of the criticism? It is not that

March 29, 1951

GG-2

the Department spends too much money; it is not even that the Department is anti-labour in its operations. It is chiefly that the Department does not function in a manner that the industrial changes of the province call for. That is the main criticism. We ask, year after year, that you spend more money, that you modernize the Department, that you equip your Department with the kind of machinery that will render the service to the working people of this province they have a right to expect. It is true that from time to time there are profound differences of opinion between the government and opposition groups on labour legislation. That is to be expected, and is natural because the government, after all, represents a certain party, the Conservative Party; Labour groups represent the labour point of view. But leaving aside for the moment the sharp differences which arise in instances of special legislation, the main criticism is that the Department is not advancing fast enough, is not modernized, is not stream-lined and does not do a lot of things that it should do.

MR. DALEY: Well, the fact is that has been proven untrue.

MR. SALSBERG: I will come to that. It is even evidenced by the attendance here tonight. I would like to see the government benches filled when the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) speaks on Estimates. I would like every hon. member supporting the government to feel that this is an important department, not just a secondary one. . Until a minute ago, before I commenced speaking, there was a "baker's dozen"; now, of course, that I have started, a number of hon. members came in, and I welcome them.

March 29, 1951

GG-3

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN hon. MEMBER: We are all here.

MR. SALSBERG: Particularly my loyal supporters from the government side that sit so close to me.

AN hon. MEMBER: Well, we are leaving shortly.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to see the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) sitting closer to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), because I think the functions he and his Department perform, are of such a nature that he should be among the senior ^{hon.} ministers in the cabinet.

Let us take another example or two to illustrate what I mean. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) complained that he has not the number of inspectors he requires, both for factory inspection and for conciliation services. The fact is that the Department does not pay a factory inspector enough to induce a skilled mechanic to leave his job and accept a government job. In many instances. I think that is true. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) stated at a meeting of the Labour Committee this year -- we were all glad to get together on that occasion -- that he could not get steamfitters qualified to serve as boiler inspectors.

MR. DALEY: I said it was difficult.

MR. SALSBERG: The fact is that a good steamfitter, who is a union man, working under a union contract, will earn as much, if not more, at his trade than he will receive if he becomes an inspector, and naturally you will have difficulties in getting good inspectors. What does it show? That the

March 29, 1951

GG-4

Department does not meet the financial and other requirements to attract the people it requires. And I would like to see the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) fight for money, fight for what he needs in the way of-----

MR. DALEY: I never had to.

MR. SALSBERG: ---equipment.

MR. DALEY: I get all the money I want.

MR. SALSBERG: Let me take another illustration.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), introduced a Bill last year which I will not say is the worst bill, but I certainly will not say it is the best. It is natural for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and the government to praise their wares. Of course it is only natural for them to say that their legislation is the best. But in the drafting of the Bill last year, there was an outcropping on every side of the kind of thinking that keeps the Department in the position that it is in. For instance, that fantastic proposal last year, ^{which} the government withdrew after a storm of protest that rose from the ranks of labour, to deny the services of the Department to an international union in case of a so-called "wildcat" strike of any of its units. It is fantastic to come forward with such legislation.

MR. DALEY: We just "flew a kite" on that.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, it was more than a kite. The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says he "flew a kite". That wasn't a kite, Mr. Minister (Mr. Daley), that was a bomb full of explosives that caused people to scurry before the fuse even reached the end. How could a department that is stream-lined, that is modern, that is aware that it is functioning in 1950 and not in 1867 come forward with----

March 29, 1951

GG-5

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) that I noticed the operation in which we were all interested, the other day, the matter of the milkmen. Everybody else got their hands and feet and everything else into that picture, and became exhausted, tired out and frazzled. There were pictures in the paper showing the state of exhaustion of both employees and employers. It was dreadful. The men were out on strike and everything went bad -- until our poor, abused Department of Labour got into it and settled it in a matter of a few hours.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Now, can we not get this Estimate passed, and stop unloading conversation?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: If you want an example of the efficiency of this Department, just see what was done last week. And who settled it? The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and his Chief Conciliation Officer, Louis Fine, when everybody else tried their hands at it and made a mess of it.

Now, why not call it a day and put these Estimates through?

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I assure the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) he will get the Estimates through tonight, if I know what is what.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: I would say so.

March 29, 1951

GG-6

MR. SALSBERG: I also suggest to him that he need not seek at this moment ^{to take} credit for the settlement of that strike.

MR. FROST: I do not know who else you would give it to.

MR. SALSBERG: He got more credit than he expected, from the way the newspapers reported it. . And I might say to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) that, so far, I am the third hon. member to speak on these Estimates and no one has hurled any bricks, in fact I thought there were altogether too many bouquets for the good of the Department. Is that not right? So the hon. Premier (Mr. Forst) can sit there very peacefully and not worry. They are getting what credit they deserve, but it is proper and necessary to emphasize the weaknesses which we feel should be improved.

I mentioned one incident ^{of} last year. There was another incident last year in the Bill; proposal that members of negotiating committees in plants must consist of certain people and no others. That is outlandish in 1950, and the Department should wake up and realize that you cannot bring in such legislative proposals, today.

Let me illustrate the point by another experience We have, to my knowledge, at least since I came

here, in 1944, been demanding of the government that it issue materials that will help the labour movement and that will provide the province as a whole with the essential facts, and knowledge of the labour situation. It is almost trite to say that people in this province can

March 29, 1951

GG-7

get more materials and more knowledge on the growing of sugar beets, the care of sheep, /^{and on} the problems of hog raising, than ^{they} can on labour problems. I fully agree with what the Department of Agriculture is doing, and as an member of this House I am often very proud to receive the materials that Department issues on junior farmers, crops, fruit and so on. It is excellent. But if any member of a trade union or any person in the province or anyone from outside of the province were to ask me for materials on the labour situation in Ontario, I would have nothing to offer him,-----

MR. DALEY: You send them to me.

MR. SALSBERG: ----except what is contained in Federal publications, or the----

MR. DALEY: Send them to me, I will tell them.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says: "Send them to me, and I will give them information." I do not think it should be necessary. For instance, I should like to know as an member of this House, periodically how you are advancing in your work that you spoke of this evening on the apprenticeship. I think that is a very important field of work, and if the Department of Agriculture properly issues material on junior farming, why can you not issue bulletins three or four times a year on the apprenticeship work, experiences, the number of graduates, the problems they have when they graduate, how they fit into industry, and so on?

(Take HH follows)

HH-1

That is true of further phases, the rate of industrial accidents indicates how to reduce them, the work of your inspectors to curtail the number of accidents, what is the employment picture in the province at given times? I think those are certainly just demands to make of the Department, and the Department has not yet accepted its responsibilities, because, I say, it does not yet function, does not appreciate its role at the present time, and also because its thinking is conditioned by the Conservative policy which is reflected in the Government's own labour policies. The Government proposed last year that outlandish plan which was withdrawn to bar other than workers of given plants in negotiating in committees, and yet the Government took the same stand and gave a very bad example when they refused to meet with an outsider who was the elected spokesman of civil servants. I mentioned this earlier in this Session, and I mention it now to illustrate again the point I am driving home, that this Government could have set an example to this country during the great railroad strike in coming to terms with the railroad unions and preventing a strike on the Northland Railroad which belongs to this province. There ^{was} nothing to stop this province from doing that. There were outcries in the papers that certain points in the north were deprived of food, people were starving in Northern communities, people left their homes and roamed the highways, to get food. Yet our railroad could have operated if the Government had granted their modest demands, the demands of the

HH-2

railroad workers.

Now then, I will limit myself to these few remarks of a general character, merely to point out further the importance of basic change in the Department, both in thinking and in operation. I want to quote what the two main labour groups said only a few weeks ago to this government. I do that in order to fortify my appeal to the Government for necessary changes, so that no one will say that I as a member of a certain party suggests these things. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), was there with the representatives of the A. F. of L. unions of this province, and I am now quoting:

"The Federation feels, however, that the Act must have further amendments before it can be truly described as an equitable piece of legislation which fully recognizes the workers' position at the labour-management bargaining table. The new Act, in places, tends to emphasize an assumption that it should be fairly difficult to organize a bona fide trade union, but, on the other hand, it should be relatively easy to take the bargaining rights away from a trade union."

I suggest to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) those are strong words, and stronger words were stated by the spokesman for the C.C.L. unions when they sat, and I am quoting now from their memorandum to the Government, they said the following:

"Failing some sensible approach of this kind,

the legislation as it now stands simply encourages the lapsing of contracts. We must remind you that we have repeatedly warned the Government of the growing resentment of the workers over Labour Legislation of this kind. If this development continues, labour leaders will no longer be responsible for the actions of their people."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think those two statements by those spokesmen of the major trade unions in the province should be taken seriously by the Government and consideration given ^{to them.} They should try to show in the work and in the amendments that are necessary to the Labour Relations Act and other labour legislation,

that they are really trying to meet the minimum of requirements of labour in this great industrial province. The province is now making further headway in the direction of industrialization, the Department of Labour is a major department, a major branch of Government and --

MR. FROST: We so regard it.

MR. SALSBERG: And yet it may be understandable that you go around and praise your own work. You should also understand that much of the praise that you are heaping on yourselves is hardly warranted and there is much to be done, much is expected from organized labour, and from the people of this province.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with the previous speakers who have commended the Department for its efficiency, but

HH-4

I also agree with them when they say your Department is inadequate to meet the demands that are thrust upon it. Now, I would like to cite a case from another angle than has been expressed by the previous speaker. In May, 1950, Local 205 Painters and Decorators of America, and Master Painters in the city of Hamilton made an agreement, which ^{was} based an increase in wages of ten cents per hour and five cents an hour conditional on the zone, the Hamilton zone being brought under the Industrial Standards Act. They applied, I believe, to the government, at that time to come under the regulations of the Industrial Standards Act in the Hamilton zone. One part of the agreement was if they did not receive approval for publication in the Ontario Gazette in six months they would get the five cents additional raise. Well, I see on March 17, 1951, exactly nine months after, regulation is made, is nine months after the application. Of course, you can see during that time that the painters and decorators have suffered some financial loss, and I am wondering if there is not some explanation for it. I would like to tell you why we are interested in the city of Hamilton in getting under these industrial standard regulations. In certain hotels and industries in the city of Hamilton, they are employing displaced persons at less than the prevailing rates, and it is the job of the same trade union movement to try to organize these workmen for their own protection. However, you realize how difficult it is to point out to these people that they should be earning

HH-5

far .better wages, more in relation to what their Canadian brothers are getting. I am anxious to hear why there is such delay in making an application to come under regulations and then nine months after we find that it is made. Could the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) explain the delay on that?

MR. DALEY: Well, of course, I would not accept any responsibility for delays coming under industrial standards. The process is that if any trade or any group in any particular zone wish to come under the Industrial Standards Act, they make application to me for a conference. We will call a conference between the representatives of the employers and the employees and with some talking with our people, they may come to an agreement as to what the wage rate and certain conditions of employment will be. If they agree, it is simply a matter of passing an order-in-council bringing into effect the regulations. Of course, regulations have to be drawn up and there is some legal work to do, but nine months is simply out of the question. I do not know the particular case, at least, I just do not recall it, but it must have been delay on the part of the ^{employer}. We did not delay it. We have men who will go there the minute they want a conference. We will be there. We are holding conferences all over the province, and certainly there is no delay on our part, it must have been the employers themselves.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman, there is one point I would like to raise, ^{which} was raised by the

hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) in connection with the training of men over forty years of age. In the city of London my federal colleague went to work on this because he, like the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) recognizes its importance. He had extra staff added to the Unemployment Insurance office there, whose job it was to do nothing except help those people over forty-five years of age. But, that is not going far enough. You want to help train people for those jobs as well as find new jobs. I would commend this to the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), because there is no field of Dominion-Provincial co-operation that will bear better fruit than you taking up your responsibilities at this end.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of remarks to make, I might as well do it now and then we can pass these estimates. There has been criticism of the slowness with which we get certification, and I suggest to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) perhaps something could be done to step up that operation. It would be in the interests of all, I think, if some certifications were not held up as long as they are. I know sometimes there is no application, still some long delays occur. I am not now criticizing the conciliation officers. Many of the conciliation boards have proceeded for months; rather than make a long agreement. I refer the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to the legislation in the province of Alberta. I do not know whether the Department has considered the Alberta legislation, but

and, indeed, the Government has been very successful.

The Government has been very successful in the

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

and in the success of the Government has been very

HH-7

there is a provision in the law which, I think, would be worth considering, which, in essence is this: that the Board may proceed after so many days, and then if it is unanimous in its decision that it should proceed further, it can then in writing ask the Minister for permission.

Now, I realize that creates a further ministerial responsibility, but it seems to me, to have worked out very well in the province of Alberta. I am not holding that up as a model, but you have to proceed pace slowly in all these things, and where something works very well, I think it is worth considering.

(Take II follows.)

II-1

I think I suggested this to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) before, but there should be some way of making available the results of conciliation boards. I realize that requires a certain amount of stenographic and other assistance to get the work out. The Province of Alberta, I notice recently has published a sort of review, of ^{those} who asked for certification, who secured certification, those who did not get it, why they did not get it, who asked for conciliation officers, how many settlements were achieved, how many conciliation boards there were, what was effected, and what sort of settlements were achieved. At least it was a step in the direction of making public the results of these activities. I do not suggest that was a perfect thing, in itself, but as far as I know, it was the first time any province has made any information of that kind public, regarding that sort of activity under a Labour Relations Act.

I commend that.

Gradually, perhaps, we could get to the point where the results of conciliation boards could be made available for the guidance of new conciliation boards, unions and employers in these matters. After all, I presume that we can all agree we are in at least a system of industrial relations which is not likely to pass, and we had better know what has gone before in order to guide us in our present circumstances, and in our future activities.

While I am on my feet, I may say I have only one other matter with which I want to deal. We passed a

Labour Relations Act last year. Whether we agree that is a good or a bad act is not very important at this stage; we are testing it; but, from my observation, it is not satisfactory for the building trades. That is a very special case because it is not what may be considered a continuous employment, and at the same time it could not be considered in the normal sense of the word a seasonal employment -- in other words, you go to work for an employer while he has a job, and even in the midst of the summer season, leave his employment and go into the employment of another employer altogether. A grievance which may exist with a former employer may, under the present legislation, be not settled when the worker leaves his employment and proceeds to gain employment with another employer.

I suggest to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that he has had various applications and representations from the building trade unions. He knows my relation with those unions. I am suggesting to him that it is worthy of consideration by the Department to draw up not a new Act, but that a special section be devised and placed in the Labour Relations Act to cover this very special group of workers -- and a large group of workers -- a group which has its own special problems and which is very necessary in the economy of Ontario -- the building trades workers -- in consultation with the industry, which is a very well organized industry, and with the unions in industry which are also very well organized.

I think it would assist the industry, both the employer and the employee, and I

II-3

think it would assist the Labour Relations Board and the Department of Labour to provide for some special considerations, arrangements, and procedures for that group of important people in our economy.

MR. DALEY: I know that problem very well. It is a very difficult thing to handle. The men are moving and just about to become organized when they are gone. The speed of getting certification is a problem. They are booked ahead now, until May some time. We anticipate that we will see the board up and that probably some kind of meeting each month will be enough. The developments ^{are} just rolling up. I think we are doing the best we can. I have not heard too many complaints. Occasionally there is one which backfires a bit. In general, I think it is going very well. I think we have a pretty competent board.

With respect to the publications, I presume that you know we are issuing now a Press release on relief. We hope to enlarge ^{it} and make it more interesting. It is a new venture. We started it a couple of months ago. Actually, we have nothing to hide; everything which comes in is available. I decided we would give the Press a statement of relief. I believe the papers during the Session have so much other Government business, that they cannot devote too much space to this kind of report. We hope as we go along to develop that into an interesting document which would inform those interested with respect to what is going on.

II-4

MR. WISMER: One more word in that respect.

It is not from the standpoint of making press releases of which I speak, Mr. Minister (Mr. Daley); week after week I get requests in my office from unions -- and we have about three thousand of them -- asking "What happened in a conciliation between our own

people before?" In other words, it is not the interesting angle, it is the straight reference with which we are concerned. They asked, "What happened last year," or "What happened two months ago in a similar situation?" Of course, that, as you know, is not available.

Votes 95 to 98 agreed to.

On Vote 99.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG:(St.Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 99, I want to make an appeal to the government to reconsider its position taken a year ago, and to adopt a more favourable view to the appeal I am making again.

A year ago, after the tragic experience of a fire in a factory building in my constituency which took the lives of nine men and women, I appealed to the government to set up a select committee of the House to study all of the existing regulations, and laws governing the protection of life and limb of workers from the hazards of fire. I did that in the form of a or resolution which I placed on the Order Paper. The resolution finally came before the House. I am sorry to say that the Government -- and I think, particularly, the Hon. Minister of Labour

(Mr. Daley)—was disinclined to the suggestion, and the resolution was voted down. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) stated at the time that the officials of the Department concerned with this problem "will, if necessary, obtain regulations and bring in new ones."

At the opening of the Session I put a question on the Order Paper which read as follows:

- "(1) Were any new regulations adopted since March 1, 1950 by the Factory Inspection Branch of the Department of Labour with a view to reducing the hazards of fire in industrial and commercial establishments in Toronto?
- (2) If so, on what date were they made, and when did they become operative?
- (3) What are those regulations?"

In due time, the Department provided the answer. The answer was: "No . No new regulations were adopted."

MR. DALEY: That is right.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I do appeal to the Government to approach this problem, not from the point of view of people responsible for a department who are trying, perhaps naturally to defend it, but to view it from a broader viewpoint. I say that the regulations which are now in operation are terribly antiquated and unsuitable for present conditions.

MR. DALEY: Did you ever read them?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, I have. I might say that at the inquest which was held in the city of Toronto, astonishing facts were brought out . , instance, no violation of any provincial^{or} city regulation

II-6

or by-law, was committed by anyone in the building where the fire took place, and where nine people perished. that there is no regulation to prevent the placing of steel bars on windows. , It was quite within the law. It was quite within the law to have exits from the building as existed in that situation. There was nothing unlawful in the partitions which were erected in the building.

I want to say again and again, Mr. Chairman, I am not ^{finding} fault with the Factory Inspections Act. I told the Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) privately, and I repeat it here, for the record, I did not know the people involved, who figured in the Press after that tragedy. I have nothing against any one of them individually. I do not seek to have anyone replaced by anyone else, but I do suggest to the government to heed the appeal made by the Chief Coroner who presided at that inquest, and to take into account the recommendations of the jury which sat at that inquest.

Both the Coroner and the jury urged upon the governments concerned to change the present regulations and laws so as to prevent a recurrence of such tragedies in the future.

The matter was brought to the attention of the City Council, Toronto. City Council decided it was a provincial matter and referred the entire matter to the province. Nothing was done by either the city or the province. No new regulations were adopted, according to the answer to my question. The Department feels

II-7

that the old regulations are sufficient. Yet, under the old regulations nine people perished in a fire.

What I am suggesting to the Hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and to the Government and to all hon. members of this House, is that we permit a select committee of this House to be appointed to study the regulations, call witnesses, bring in experts from the Fire Marshal's office, municipal representatives, inspectors of provincial and city departments concerned with this responsibility, study the existing regulations, and then make recommendations which will provide greater safeguards than are now provided for the protection of life. It is not something which will call for the expenditure of money by

the province. That is not it at all. If new regulations are found necessary, the owners of buildings, operators of factories and stores will be given a chance at the appropriate time to make alterations, if alterations be necessary. I suggest it is a reasonable proposal to make, and a reasonable step for the government to take. It will not cost the taxpayers any money. It may, of necessity, call for the expenditure of some money by individuals who own or operate businesses in buildings.

That is nothing in comparison with the saving of lives.

We had another tragedy in Toronto, in a dwelling over a store, where the lives, I think, of three people were taken. That may come more directly under the city regulations than under the province, it is true, but I think the city would welcome an opportunity to

II-8

appear before such a committee, make constructive proposals, and accept recommendations which may come forward after those deliberations.

(Take JJ follows)

JJ-1

MR. SALSBERG: I said to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) only today -- and I repeat it here again -- that from even a narrow political consideration there is every reason why the government should accede to that proposal. I said to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) -- and I repeat tonight -- the government can lose nothing politically by setting^{up} such a Committee. On the other hand, it can gain a great deal. If important regulations are adopted as the result of the deliberations of such a Committee the Government will, of course, take all the credit which they deserve. If, on the other hand, the studies of such Committee should show that no radical changes are necessary, they will not be blamed as they are now justly blamed, for tragedies of that sort as a result of regulations, which people say -- and^{which} I say -- are not adequate. So there is no reason why the government nor the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) should resist the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I am so convinced of the necessity for such a Committee that I am re-vamping now, and am sending to the Clerk of the House, the resolution which was on the Order Paper last year, so that it may go again on the Order Paper, in the hope that the government will change its attitude, and will agree to the setting up of such a Select Committee.

I conclude with an appeal to the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley); please change your attitude towards this proposal; please understand there is nothing in anybody's sleeve in this proposal. If there is a shadow

29th March

JJ-2

of suspicion in the mind of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), or anyone else, that such a Committee will be utilized for political purposes against the government, then I assure the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) publicly that I, for one, have no such desire, and no such design, nor has anybody else. Last year, when the question came up hundreds of workers in that section of the city where the tragedy took place signed a petition to this government pleading with them to set up such a Committee. They did not want to be caught in another tragic situation as befell some of their colleagues.

I told the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) that some years ago -- 30 years or so -- there was a tragedy in New York known as the "Triangle fire", which took the lives of 30 girls in a garment factory. It shocked this continent, and resulted in the re-vamping of shop, factory and office building regulations, and the conditions were improved. Surely we should not wait for such a tragedy to occur here.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) says he has confidence in his Department and his staff. I am not questioning his right to feel that way, nor am I questioning any branch of his Department, but I do appeal to him to agree to set up such a Committee. The government will have its majority there; the regulations are not those passed by this government alone; they have accumulated all through the years, and if anything is wrong, it cannot necessarily be laid at the door of this government which is in power today. It perhaps could be laid at the door of every government which preceded them, or

it may be that it can be laid at the door of no government. It may be that the regulations are antiquated.

I end with this appeal to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to agree to setting up such a Committee, and giving us the opportunity of studying this question, and getting the advice and experience of all the people in his Department, so that we may present at the first opportunity recommendations which can be implemented in the form of new legislation, and new regulations, and a better integration of the inspection work of the province and the city, so that tragedies such as the one which took place in Toronto a little over a year ago will not recur.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Chairman, I have the regulations, pursuant to sub-section 5 of Section 58 of the Factory, Shop and Office Buildings Act, which we think constitute a pretty fair set of regulations. I am not trying to suggest that any regulations cannot be improved, but after that very disastrous fire occurred, with which we were so deeply concerned, and after a very careful examination, and meetings held with the Fire Marshall, the City Building Commissioner of Toronto, the Fire Chief, and the Joint Fire Prevention Bureau, and consultations, we have adopted a system, which I do not think even regulations could take care of.

This is something that requires the cooperation of all the people engaged in anything that has anything to do with the prevention of fire, and the removal of hazards.

JJ-4

We have the Fire Chief and his deputies -- I think in Toronto there are 14 or 15; maybe more -- and men under the Fire Marshal Act, who are deputized, and it is their job to prevent fires. They are experts, and they have all the force of law behind them in insisting on conditions which are not correct being rectified, such as partitions, cutting escapes, and the building of fire escapes. These men, under the Fire Marshal Act, and appointed by the Fire Marshal under that Act, have all the authority to see that matters are corrected. We have an agreement worked out with them, and it is working out very satisfactorily, and if they issue an order to a certain individual to remove a partition or open a doorway, or do certain things to remove a fire hazard, they send us a copy of that report, and in turn our inspectors will do the same thing with them. We have a very nice arrangement; the purpose of our both knowing what is going on, is to avoid duplication, that is, one inspector coming in and issuing an order contradictory to what a former inspector had issued.

We are working in complete cooperation, with these 14 or 15 deputized inspectors, who have plenty of men under them, and that is so in most cities where there are fire departments, and you have in my department some 40 or 50 inspectors. The men engaged in fire prevention and inspection are specialists. My men are watching for fire hazards, noticing as they go through industry any possible fire hazard, particularly in the old buildings. The new buildings are taken care of, because certain regulations have to be lived up to in the erection of new buildings,

29th March

JJ- 5

but in some of these old buildings,

which have been turned over from one business to another --

MR. SALSBERG: Pardon me; the tragedy I mentioned was in a new building, and every inspector of the province and city stated under oath that there was nothing wrong with the building; that there was no violation, and yet the Coroner and the jury said we must change the regulations, if ^{the} regulations permitted the impediment in question. That was a new building.

MR. DALEY: It was a very small room. I am speaking from memory, but I think it was 30 feet by 30 feet --

MR. SALSBERG: A modern building.

MR. DALEY: One person, after the fire broke out, went right out. I am as sorry as you are at the loss of life --

MR. SALSBERG: There were bars on the windows.

MR. DALEY: We do not accept that. It might have easily have been two or three floors above the ground. There was a proper escape, and we can only assume they did not think the fire was serious, and they moved around to get their belongings, and the fire may have come up with a rush, and engulfed them.

MR. SALSBERG: The fire was at the door. One man went through the flames; the others were afraid. The windows were barred.

MR. DALEY: It was only 15 feet. But, at any rate, we feel that we are getting the cooperation of the big cities. We have the same sort of co-operative work in Toronto, Hamilton, Kitchener, Galt, North York, Oshawa, and others,

THE FIRST PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE SECOND PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE THIRD PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE FOURTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE FIFTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE SIXTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE SEVENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE EIGHTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE NINTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE ELEVENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWELFTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE THIRTEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE FOURTEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE FIFTEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE SIXTEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE SEVENTEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE EIGHTEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE NINETEENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTIETH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-FIRST PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-SECOND PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-THIRD PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-FOURTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-FIFTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-SIXTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE TWENTY-NINTH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE THIRTIETH PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE THIRTY-FIRST PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

THE THIRTY-SECOND PART OF THE BOOK IS A HISTORY OF THE

and we are working along the line of getting the co-operation of the people in these municipalities who are actually capable of doing that kind of work, and we feel that we are making good progress. We have certainly tightened up in our factory inspection, in connection with fires.

I feel the Committee I have named, and with whom we have had discussions, is composed certainly of the type of people who know something about prevention of fires.

MR. SALSBERG: Would you at least, Mr. Minister (Mr. Daley) not say "no" tonight, but think about it.

MR. DALEY: I will not say "no", because if I could get advice which would enable me to prevent one fire a year and save one life, I would feel very, very happy.

Vote 99 agreed to.

On Vote 100:

MR. J.L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): On Vote 100, Mr. Chairman. "The Board of Examiners of Operating Engineers". We have a condition in the City of Hamilton which I will draw to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and the Deputy Minister, concerning one of the largest steel companies in Canada, "Stelco", where they have some eight or ten steam locomotives. The operators of these locomotives require a certificate of qualifications. A certificate of qualifications which these men require consists not only of regulations governing the same, but they must also have experience of at least 18 months, and their seniority in the plant, through the process of collective bargaining is established on the date of that certificate.

29th March, 1951

JJ-7

We ran into a bit of a problem, and I believe the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is aware of it in that this particular plan ^{was} attempting to dieselize their traction equipment in the yards and ⁱⁿ the different departments. There is nothing in the regulations concerning operating engineers which would require operators to agree to such a plan to secure a certificate.

(TAKE "KK" FOLLOWS)

In other words, the position of the present operator is such that their **seniority**, which is the only department in the plant which is not on a plant-wide basis of seniority, is so affected that they feel that the company could,-- not that they will -- abuse the privilege of placing inexperienced men on the dieselized locomotives, replacing the steam locomotives, without the proper certificate of qualification.

I have been asked by the . . . group involved to draw this to the Minister's attention. I spoke to him personally about it, ^{and} sent notes across the floor; he told us he intended to bring the Act up to date next year. But what is he going to do with the Commission between now and next year? Is it possible under the regulations to place a provision in the regulations that not only does this apply to the present system of steam locomotives, but includes Diesel locomotives as well? .

MR. DALEY: I know my hon. friend realizes that he drew this to my attention sometime during this Session, and I assured him that we would certainly give it consideration. I cannot, especially during a busy time of the Session, and the operation of my Department, make regulations just overnight. I cannot immediately bring out something. I assure him I will give it consideration. I realize the difficulty. The hon. member says himself that he does not think the company is going to penalize these people or do any of the things he suggests that they might do. As I have said, we are intending to re-vamp the Operating Engineers Act. We shall start on it almost at the end of this Session. It takes quite a while to develop these things.

29th March 1951

KK-2

We will certainly give the question/consideration, and if the meantime we can develop something by regulation I can assure him we will consider it.

MR.DOWLING: I have that assurance.

MR. DALEY: You have it.

MR. DOWLING: I want to make it clear that there is no attempt on my part to say that the company is going to abuse this. I do not think they will. At the same time, there are two factors involved. These men should be qualified, and they should have the 18 months' experience and training as ^{they} did the first operators. I think that if it was provided that they had to, their certificate would be their deed of security, and therefore they would follow along the natural process. I have the assurance of the Minister that he will take this into consideration, and if he puts in a regulation, it will at least correct that condition and provide some assurance against certain dangers, because there is a tremendous hazard in that particular plant because of the long milage into the different departments, that employers might be run over or perhaps ^{be} hit by some incompetent operator of a Diesel locomotive.

MR. DALEY: I have given the assurance.

Vote No. 100 agreed to.

Vote No. 101 agreed to.

Vote No. 102 agreed to.

Vote No. 103 agreed to.

Vote No. 104 agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister):

On Vote No. 149 - Main Office.

29th March 1951

KK-3

MR. L. E. WISMER(Riverdale): I am always very gentle with the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). I just wonder if the Provincial Treasurer might explain what happened to a couple of Bills that passed last year, with regard to personal income tax. It does not seem to have been a lie. No special Session of the Legislature was called to put them into effect. I wonder if the Prime Minister would explain to the Committee just what happened to those.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): They are still in the stage of negotiations.

Mr. WISMER: Oh no, you would not say that!

Vote No. 149 agreed to.

Votes 150 - 154 inclusive agreed to.

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. F. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways & Means begs to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Tomorrow we will proceed with Government Orders, with Bills, and that will leave us next week for the residue of the Bills here, and also the Budget debate, and the Bills that I mentioned this afternoon.

There are one or two Private Members' Bills, in connection with Highway matters which we will call, and it might be possible to work in some of the other Bills, too, during the week.

Mr. McEWING (Wellington North): You will not call the Highway Bills tomorrow?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): No.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.09 of the clock P.M.

✓. 39

A-1

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

Motions.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker,
I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Frost:

That the House have permission to withdraw
the motion made on the 27th instant for the appointment
of a Select Committee to inquire into the administration
of justice in the province and substitute the following
therefor.

That a Select Committee of this House be
appointed to study the administration of criminal
justice in the province of Ontario, including the
constitution, maintenance and organization of Provincial
courts of criminal jurisdiction, the operation and
administration of Provincial penal laws, the consti-
tution, maintenance and organization of the various
police forces in the province, and particularly the
methods and procedure adopted for the detection,
prosecution and prevention of breaches of the
criminal law as to gambling, betting and similar
offences, and to include in its report any recommenda-
tions considered advisable.

The Committee to have authority to sit during
the interval between Sessions, and shall have full
power and authority to call for persons, papers and
things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the

Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendance before the said Select Committee of such persons, and the production of such papers and things as the said Select Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable The Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The said Committee to consist of seven Members and to be composed as follows: Messrs. Porter (Chairman), Janes, Villeneuve, Downer, Jolliffe, Grummett, Houck.

In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of the Committee, the vacancy shall be filled by the appointment of a member on the nomination of the Leader of the party to which the committee member belonged.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucette, that a Select Committee be appointed to direct the expenditure of any sum certified in the Estimates for Art Purposes, such Committee to be composed as follows: Messrs. Cathcart (Chairman), Chartrand, Leavens, Martin, Morrow, Mackenzie and Pryde.

The said Committee to be authorized to sit during the interval between Sessions, to give further consideration to the plan for the encouragement of amateur art in the Province as suggested by the preceding Committee, and to purchase such pictures of Ontario subjects by Ontario artists as the Committee

A-3

may decide.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

THE INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT, 1951

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr.

Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Insurance Act, 1951" and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is intended to cover four main points. The first is with reference to reciprocal deposits provisions. Certain amendments are provided with respect to that matter.

The provisions of The Insurance Act dealing with administration of deposits and reciprocal deposits, were found inadequate to meet any of the problems which recently arose when an insurance company went into liquidation. The whole matter was studied by special committee set up by the provincial Superintendents of Insurance, which submitted proposed amendments to the Insurance Act of the various provinces. Accordingly, the provisions dealing with administration of deposits and reciprocal deposits are revised and can be found in Section 5 of this Bill.

In the second place, authority is given for a form of automobile underwriters policies which some of the companies wish to enter into, known as the comprehensive form of policy.

For a number of years the automobile underwriters have been preparing a new form of standard automobile policy which is known as "The Comprehensive Form". This work is now completed and has been approved by the Association of Superintendents of Insurance of the provinces of Canada.

Extended coverage is given a policyholder. It will cover not only his own automobile as described in the application, and also a newly acquired automobile, a temporarily substituted automobile and any other private passenger type of automobile which is being driven by the insured or his or her spouse.

The policy also extends the coverage by what is known as "The Comprehensive Item" which covers loss or damage to the insured automobile from any cause other than by collision. It also provides for compensation by way of medical payments for injuries sustained by the driver and passenger of an insured automobile.

In the third place, I might say, this is giving authority for this type of policy which was not covered in the Act, as it now exists. Provision is made to cover a technical defect which appears in the present legislation. At present, under the Act, where a wife seeks to change the designation of her husband as beneficiary under an insurance policy where he has been living apart from her for some years, she is required to prove "that he is living apart from his wife in circumstances disentitling him to an order for restitution of conjugal rights." Apparently for a long time no serious case arose under it, but it has been found

A-5

that in Ontario there is no law whereby husbands can secure an order for restitution of conjugal rights, as such a provision was not imported from the law of England into our Statute law. The Section is, therefore, amended to remedy the situation.

In the fourth place, provision is made to create a classification to be known as "Salesman" who will be required to be licensed as such. Heretofore they have been exempt from licensing provisions. That refers to salesmen employed by insurance agencies.

(Take B follows.)

THE COMPANIES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Companies Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

First reading of the bill.

MR. PORTER: The reason I, rather than the Provincial Secretary, am introducing the bill, is that the amendments contained in this bill are complementary to those that I have mentioned in The Insurance Act with reference to the liquidation and winding up of insurance companies. The provisions dealing with the liquidation and winding up of insurance companies are at present set out in Sections 307-314 of the Companies Act. These provisions were found to be inadequate with respect to the liquidation and winding up of an insurance company, which I mentioned in introducing the Insurance Act amendments; and as the result, the Superintendents of insurance have reported that certain provisions of the Companies Act be amended to bring it into line with the amendments introduced. The provisions are therefore revised in accordance with the commissions of the Committee.

THE PHARMACY AMENDMENT ACT

HON. M. PHILLIPS (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Foote, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Pharmacy Act", and that the same be now read a

first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. PHILLIPS: This amendment involves three things. First, at present the section forbids an unregistered person to compound prescriptions.

To-day many prescriptions are not compounded but are filled by handing out the article in a prepared form. The amendment is designed to prevent the filling of a prescription in any manner by an unqualified person.

Second, the section dealing with cancellation and suspension of registrations is revised and authority is given to the council to cancel registrations on the grounds of mental incompetency, and a right of appeal to the Supreme Court of a decision of the council is given when registration has been cancelled.

Third, this amendment will prevent the indiscriminate sale of drugs and medicines by pharmaceutical manufacturers to retailers who are not entitled to sell them to the public. The bill really involves the pharmaceutical group of druggists.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf, I am sure, of all the ^{hon.} members of the House and all associated with this House, to wish to our Clerk, Major Lewis, and

B-3

his wife, many happy returns of the day, because tomorrow is their fiftieth wedding anniversary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: One would hardly think, while viewing the Clerk and his wife, that half a century has gone by since two people so youthful looking were married, back in 1901.

HON. MR. DALEY: She must have stood a lot!

MR. FROST: I have known Major Lewis a great many years, and I think he is one of those fortunate people whom the lapse of years seems to make younger instead of older. Major Lewis has been long connected with this House. I believe his first connection with it, as a member of the Press gallery, was back in the days of Sir Oliver Mowatt, back in the late 90's. He says, "The early 90's." Excuse me; I was trying to let him down easily. It was in the early 90's that, when Sir Oliver Mowatt was Prime Minister of this province, he was first connected with this House as a member of the Press gallery. Since that time a great deal of water has gone under the bridge. We have lived in very spectacular times, and Major Lewis has seen a great deal, first as a member of the Press Gallery, later as a member of the House to which he was elected for one of the Toronto seats about thirty years ago, and latterly as the Clerk of the Assembly. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we all want to extend to Major Lewis and his good wife our best wishes for health and happiness, and we hope they will be spared

to enjoy it together and be with us for many more happy anniversaries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (York South): Mr. Speaker, we would not wish this opportunity to pass without adding to what has been said with respect to Major Lewis and his wife. I think that all ^{hon} members of this House are indebted to Major Lewis for his great knowledge of our procedure, his wide experience in connection with this assembly, and his extraordinary patience.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I really do not know how he manages to sit and listen to all of us; but he always seems to be just as patient as he was when I first came into this House.

I was interested to hear that he began his work in this place as a member of the Press gallery in the days of Sir Oliver Mowatt. I could not help but look up there and wonder if some younger member of the gallery to-day may be Clerk of the House sixty or seventy years from now and look back on the days when such strange people occupied the Government benches, and such strange people sat on the Opposition benches. Whether that should come to ^{pass} or not, we do wish to extend to Major Lewis and his family our heartiest congratulations on his anniversary to-morrow.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the group here, I wish to join with the other leaders in expressing to Major Lewis and his wife our most hearty congratulations on this very

B-5

memorable occasion. Major Lewis has been to all of us down through the years, a source of help and great strength, in his knowledge of the procedure of the Legislature, and we do appreciate his many kindnesses and courtesies, and marvel, as someone has said, at the patience he has exhibited down through the years.

When my friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was suggesting that someone some sixty years hence would look with astonishment at the figures that sat on the Government benches and on the benches in this particular corner, it occurred to me to wonder what he would think if he allowed his gaze to be centred on our friends to the right. Well, we will allow the years to pass and take note of his prediction as to that time.

MR. J. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): we wish, Mr. Speaker, just to make this unanimous. I am very glad to join with the others who have spoken in offering our congratulations to Major and Mrs. Lewis on the eve of their fiftieth anniversary. It seems almost impossible to believe that such a young and fresh-looking man could have been married so long. But if the Major says it is true, it must be true. I was thinking during the last moment or two ^{while} others have been speaking that perhaps it would be a very good idea if Major Lewis could be given a leave of absence from his job and permitted to spend a few years writing his reminiscences, covering these fifty years, and really telling the people of Ontario and the people of Canada what he has thought .

B-6

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would he "tell all"?

MR. MacLEOD: And tell all that has gone through his mind as he has sat in this House, both as a member and Clerk, these many years. I suggest that if Major Lewis would feel disposed to do that, he would in all probability produce a best-seller that would top even the works of the great Lloyd C. Douglas.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would be afraid to read it.

HON. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the members' attention to a "brief brief". As Chairman of the Committee on Commissions, I commend to hon. members as most excellent week-end reading the report of the Hydro. The blue-covered copy is a progress report on the five-year program, and you will find it contains extensive information. It gives an outline of the five-year program launched in 1946 and the results of the five years, the accumulation of the mileage up to December 31, 1950, the amount of money spent in the way of capital expenditure and grants for the five years, and also the accumulated expenditures and grants up to the end of the year 1950. There is a breakdown of the same information by each rural operating area. I would point out to hon. members that the information is obtainable, either by county or by constituency, due to the fact that rural operating offices or areas were established according to the transformer and transmission facilities of the Commission in that area, but any hon. member can

arrive at the mileage by deducting or adding the different parts of the rural operating areas serving each county.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the opportunity, by reason of the reference to the point which has been made by the hon. member who has just spoken, to say to the House that yesterday I referred unwittingly, somewhat sharply perhaps, to my friend from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and also to my friend from Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck). I did not intend my reference to be so understood. I will say that I think I was justified in showing some impatience because of the course which was being taken, but I did not regard either of these ^{hon. members} as any more guilty than the rest of the Opposition combined, although there were certain references that singled them out for particular attention. I assure both of them of that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We all plead not guilty.

MR. FROST: I did not mean it in that way, and if I seem to have singled them out, more than anyone else over there, I certainly apologize. I say that the sins of the combined Opposition are tremendous; their offences of commission and omission are enormous. I do not think anything I could say would stop them. The total weight and enormity of their sins in that respect ^{is enormous.} I would not want it to be thought that one or two of their members, such as the hon. member for Bellwoods and the hon. member for Niagara Falls, should bear all the censure, because the responsibility

B-8

is collective, and I would like it to be that way.

I may say that we have been anxious to give the members of the House the fullest information. This morning my friend Minister of Lands and Forests (Hon. Mr. Scott) had a meeting of his committee, and that meeting was not distinguished by a very large attendance. There will be another meeting on Monday morning, and I hope my friends opposite will come down to that Committee and receive the benefits of the information which will be given out then.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the combined opposition, may I say that if the Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) thinks that the enormity of our sins is growing day by day, we can only accept what he has said as being, to an Opposition, the highest possible compliment.

(Take C follows.)

C-1

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 272 and 273.

Order No. 33.

RURAL TELEPHONE SYSTEMS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-third Order; second reading of Bill No. 146, "An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems", Mr. Challies.

Hon. G.H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 146.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) gave an undertaking not to call this Bill until Monday. The hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Brown) said he could not be here today, but wanted to participate in the discussion.

MR. FROST: We were suggesting that it be sent on to Committee, and then I suggested we would hold it and allow any debate. I think it might be well to let it go to Committee with the understanding that the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. Brown) can discuss the Bill at that time. I have no desire to curtail any discussion on this Bill at all. Frankly, I really did not notice that the hon. member (Mr. Brown) was not in the House. If we pass it on to Committee, it may be discussed there.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this. I was waiting for the hon. Minister (Mr. Challies). I would like to say that I

think this is really a historic Bill in Ontario, and I am sure if those who followed through this House the first Bill establishing Hydro in the province of Ontario, could look upon us today, when we are introducing the first Bill establishing a unified system of telephones in the province of Ontario, they would say we were making progress.

In that connection, I thought the hon. members of the Legislature might be interested in knowing that back in this Legislature, in 1914, on the occasion of the Hydro Bill being passed through the House, Sir Adam Beck, a member of the Legislature at that time, rose in his place and in discussing the Hydro Bill, drew attention to the fact that Ontario should also have a similar Bill with respect to telephones, and he stated at that time that it was absurd that Ontario's 450 small telephone companies, were to be shut off in little, separate compartments, when they could be working together with the co-operation of the government, and, with the co-operation of the Hydro, could be rendering much better service to the people of this province, and he said if all these systems were joined under central control, say of the Hydro Electric, one staff could serve all purposes. He urged that all municipalities should appoint a Public Utility Commissions, to control gas, electric, and water supplies. He proudly declared "Nothing is too big for us. Nothing is too extensive to imagine. The whole investment will be returned to the government of Ontario in 15 years."

I say, in looking back at that statement by Sir Adam Beck, how true it has turned out to be regarding Hydro, and I venture to predict it will be just as true in regards

30th March 1951

C-3

to telephones.

I believe this Bill is very necessary, and I would like to suggest to the government as this Bill will not interfere with the Bell Telephone Company, which will just continue to serve the urban centres,

that I think the government might take this under advisement, the making of some protest to the Bell Telephone Company regarding the increase of their rates. They were granted only a 25% increase. And yet they have increased some of the rates as much as 100%. I believe this building is served by trunk lines. I know the trunk lines at the City Hall were increased from \$8. to \$18. a piece --

MR. SPEAKER: I have no knowledge of the contents of the Bill, of course, but does the question of rates come into this matter? We are discussing the principle of the Bill. I rather question whether the matter of rates has anything to do with the Bill?

MR. DENNISON: This was a connection I was dealing with, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if this Bill -- which perhaps does not go far enough -- controls that. I had in mind that point because I thought it will concern this new telephone set-up. If we set up this new provincial telephone system, we will have to get trunk lines from the Bell Telephone Company, and if the Bell Telephone Company has raised its rates more than it should, or more than they were permitted to raise them under the award, it will increase the cost to the consumers for whom we are providing service. I do not think that should happen, and I think

30th March

C-4

it should be of some concern to this House.

Finally, I would like to point out that in their last Report, the Bell Telephone reported there were 78,000 unfilled applications for telephone service in the province. That is a great number of people who want telephone service. I venture to say, if we added to that, the unfilled applications which must be in the offices of existing rural telephone lines, we would probably have about 125,000 unfilled applications for telephone service in the province, therefore, I think this Bill is very, very necessary.

Last year the use of local telephone facilities increased 10%, and the use of long distance facilities increased 13%, and yet the increased number of telephones installed only amounted to 10%, so, at the present time, we are not keeping up with the increased service required. I think this should be kept in mind.

MR. CHALLIES: The hon. member (Mr. Dennison) should know that the matter of rates is under the control of the Federal Authorities. We have the power to make a survey, and that is one problem we will run into, due to the fact that there are about 300 companies which have 100 subscribers or less. It is our intention to make survey to find out what the problems are, not only concerning the larger companies, but going down through the small companies in the province, which are struggling along, and want some guidance. With them, there may be some question about a proper financial system, but all these things will be surveyed, and we hope will be covered by a comprehensive report, and the next step, of course, will be to carry out the intent of the Act.

C-5

MR. FROST: In response to the remarks by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) it is true that nearly 40 years ago Sir Adam Beck, mentioned, as part of the Hydro Development, the possibility of rural telephones, and the fact is, it was partly because of what was said at that time that we were attracted to the Hydro as the agency which might be the answer to this problem. Experience and history have some curious angles. I have no doubt that Sir Adam Beck's venture into Hydro 30 or 35 years ago -- which proved an unsuccessful venture -- probably headed off some of these others. If instead of turning to Hydro radials in 1916 and 1917, which would have been an impossibility, because of the coming of the automobile traffic, had turned to the telephones instead, it might have been quite a different story. But he turned at that time to what appeared to be one of the obvious things, but it turned out, because of the advances of science, that he was engaged in something which was disappearing. Hydro radials have become virtually a thing of the past. Indeed, in most cities, bus traffic is superceding the street cars, except in special cases, such as we have here in the city of Toronto. It is interesting to note that 40 years ago Sir Adam Beck had this feature in mind. I hope this Bill, which the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) has referred to as an "historic Bill", will be the commencement of giving our rural people telephone services, which will be the best obtainable.

I think the hon. members of the House will agree that at this stage it is a difficult matter, and one in which we want the good will and assistance of our people,

March 30th

C-6

and I am sure with that, and with the plans which will be prepared by our experts, we will be able to lay a sure foundation for better telephone service in Ontario.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I notice, Mr. Speaker, the government is reverting to the grand and glorious custom of the past, namely a grand and eloquent preamble to a Bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 34.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty-fourth Order; second reading of Bill No. 152, "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act", Mr. Doucett.

Hon. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 152.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE; Mr. PATRICK IN THE CHAIR.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Notices of motions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution No. 7 by Mr. Porter:

"Resolved, that; the fees and expenses of the Board, the Revising Officers and Clerks, the Clerks of municipalities, and the Clerks of the Peace in connection with the revision of the list for provincial elections under part 3, shall

March 30th

C-7

be payable by the Province, and such fees and expenses shall be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund to the person entitled thereto upon the certificate of the Chairman of the Board and the Auditor of Criminal Justice Accounts".

Resolution agreed to.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

March 30, 1951.

D-1

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Porter, that,

(a) the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may authorize the issue of accountable warrants from time to time for payment of travelling and other expenses and for remuneration of officers and persons employed in the office of the Chief Election Officer; and

(b) the fees and expenses to be allowed to the returning officers, boards, and other officers and persons for services performed under The Election Act shall, so far as the same are payable by the Province, be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and for the purposes of providing funds for the payment of such fees and expenses, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may direct that accountable warrants payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund be issued from time to time in favour of any officer or other person.

as provided by Bill No. 110, The Election Act, 1951."

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Porter that,

where moneys have been paid out of The Legal Aid Fund to a solicitor for the purpose of enabling him to make necessary disbursements in connection with services performed by him under The Ontario Legal Aid Plan and have been expended by him in the payment of Crown fees or charges and such moneys are not recoverable in any other manner, the Treasurer of Ontario may, on the

March 30, 1951.

D-2

certificate of the treasurer and secretary of The Law Society of Upper Canada, remit such fees and charges to the Society, as provided by Bill No. 136, An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Kennedy that, the Minister may grant aid to assist in the establishment of swimming pools by municipalities and school boards, as provided by Bill No. 138, An Act to amend The Community Centres Act.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Porter that, where it appears by return to the Lieutenant-Governor or to any department of the Government that in any year a registrar of deeds or an officer holding the office of registrar of deeds and local master of titles has derived from the fees, emoluments and salary, if any, of his office, after deducting necessary disbursements, an income which is less than \$3,200, there may be paid on the report of the Inspector^{to}/such registrar or officer, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, an amount sufficient to make up the income for the year to \$3,200, if the Lieutenant-Governor in Council so directs. as provided by Bill No. 142, An Act to amend The Registry Act.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Phillips that, the Minister of Health may pay grants to municipalities toward the cost of maintenance of isolation hospitals, as provided by Bill No. 144, An Act to amend the Public Health Act.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Challies that, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may authorize the Treasurer of Ontario to pay to The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund such moneys as the Commission may require in the performance of its duties or in the exercise of its powers under The Rural Telephone Act, 1951.

as provided by Bill No. 146, An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Frost
(a) that, property passing on the death of the deceased shall be deemed to include any right which any person had at the time of death of the deceased under an agreement made by the deceased during his lifetime; and

(b) the exemption from taxation under subsection 1 of section 4 of The Succession Duty Act shall include any disposition where actual and bona fide enjoyment and

March 30th, 1951.

D-4

and possession of the property in respect of which the disposition is made, was assumed more than five years before the date of death of the deceased by the person to whom the disposition is made, or by a trustee for such person, and thenceforward, retained to the entire exclusion of the deceased or of any benefit to him whether voluntary or by contract or otherwise, as provided by Bill No. 148, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Frost, that, every purchaser of admission to a place of entertainment and to place of amusement shall pay to the Treasurer of Ontario for the use of His Majesty in right of Ontario a tax on the price of admission as provided by Bill No. 150, An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act.

Resolution agreed to.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution by Mr. Frost, that, (a) the Lieutenant-Governor in Council be authorized to raise from time to time by way of loan such sum or sums of money as may be deemed expedient for any or all of the following purposes: for the public service, for works carried on by commissioners on behalf of Ontario, for discharging any indebtedness or obligation of Ontario or for

D-5

reimbursing the Consolidated Revenue Fund for any moneys expended in discharging any indebtedness or obligation and for the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Legislature; provided that the principal amount of any securities issued and the amount of any temporary loans raised under the authority of Bill No. 151, An Act for Raising Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, including any securities issued for the retirement of the said securities or temporary loans, at any time outstanding, shall not exceed in the whole \$100,000,000; and

- (b) the aforesaid sum of money may be borrowed for any term or terms not exceeding forty years, at such rate as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and shall be raised upon the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Ontario, and shall be chargeable thereupon; and
- (c) the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may provide for a special sinking fund with respect to the issue herein authorized.

Resolution agreed to.

March 30, 1951.

D-6

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 20.

THE OLEOMARGARINE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twentieth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 114, "An Act to amend the Oleomargarine Act," Mr. Kennedy.

Section 1 agreed to.

On Section 2.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I thought the words "other than skim milk" had been eliminated in committee.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Chairman, I would move that in Section 2(a) of subsection 2, that where it says, "shall take or imply that oleomargarine has any relation to any dairy product other than skim milk", to cut out the words "other than skim milk".

Amendment agreed to.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) if he quite sure in his own mind that the definition is wide enough to cover advertising by radio?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes, I am quite sure, in my own mind about that.

Sections 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 114 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I would like to go to Private Bills and take No. 8, that is the Toronto Bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 8, House in Committee on Bill No. 27, "An Act respecting the City of Toronto"

March 30, 1951.

D-7

Mr. Blackwell.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

On section 3.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that section 3 be struck out.

MR. L. E. BALCKWELL (Eglinton): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about section 3 if I might. In the first place, I would say to the House that as a private member my name is on the Bill for the purpose of facilitating the usual consideration of such a Bill by the Legislature and its appropriate committee. It has been intimated to me on behalf of the government that it has objection to this section in its present form. It has also been suggested to me by the city that there is a legitimate case for consideration of some retiring allowance for Toronto Transportation Commission commissioners and under the circumstances rather than defeat this section in the Bill, as a matter of policy, I would request leave of the Legislature to withdraw the section, leaving it to the city to reconsider its position and bring forward in its private bill next year such other legislation as may be appropriate to properly deal with such a question. I would, therefore, ask leave of the House to withdraw that section and not to take a vote on it, which would represent any policy of this House.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition):

Is that in order? Is there any such animal?

Motion agreed to.

On section 3, formerly section 4:

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, on section 3, formerly

D- 8

section 4, I believe that this section should be either withdrawn and referred again to the city of Toronto for change or else amended here and I am not really prepared to propose any amendment. Now, I think the principle of a limitation on a pension granted to a department head in a municipal government which at the present time applies throughout the province,

is good, because the principle of a limitation on a pension in these cases usually rules out any favouritism that might^{be} set up in a municipality.

We know, before that limitation was put on, there was favouritism in the granting of pensions at the municipal level. I do not need to mention certain cases, but I know in the city of Toronto there was favouritism, and it caused a lot of ill feeling between department heads and certainly the taxpayers were at a loss to understand it.

The present situation in regard to Toronto, and this Bill just applies to Toronto, is that this section requests that this legislature states that the provincial limitation which applies to every other municipality in the province should not apply to the city of Toronto, and the city of Toronto shall, therefore, be entitled to grant the allowance to any department head to any officer of the corporation to any extent they wish, up to two thirds of the preceding three years salary.

That could mean in the city of Toronto in one case a grant of a retiring allowance of \$10,000. Where other department heads have already been retired on \$2,500. plus their \$600. The city of Toronto has a pension scheme for all employees. Under this pension scheme, an employee pays into it as his share of \$600. per year and the city pays a like amount

and he gets a pension of \$1200 unless he pays more and he can do that and increase his pension. A department head at the present gets the same thing except that the taxpayer makes up the difference between \$600. and \$2500., the taxpayer makes up \$1900. Now, it used to be last year and before,

that the city of Toronto gave the \$2500. from the taxpayer and then the employee had \$600. which he paid in, over and above that, so the employee actually got \$3100. They complain that the legislation we passed last year establishing the provincial maximum actually cut them down \$600. There is a case for this limit to be raised to \$3100 in the city of Toronto. I do not think a case has been made out to raise this limit up indefinitely and I believe that the Toronto members would have no criticism if we were to vote for this in its present form, and I wonder if it is within the right of this Legislature or of the hon. ~~MINISTER~~ (Mr. Blackwell) to change this wording and state that the limitation of \$2500. prescribed in this case shall not apply to Toronot but in the case of Toronto the limit shall be \$3500. or \$4000. \$3100. will bring Toronto back to where they were before. However, Mr. Chairman, I think the best plan is to let Toronto bring in legislation here in better form. I do agree with the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that they should at least have consulted the ^{Toronto} hon. members of this House, as they have done in previous years, and should have given us a little brief on the reasons for these things. They chose not to do that this year. I do not say that is the reason why it should be thrown out, but for the others reasons, I think this should be thrown out.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the

March 30, 1951.

D-10

hon. member who just spoke, (Mr. Dennison) and start from where he left off and state that the mayor of the city of Toronto -- and I single out the mayor because I think he is mainly responsible, --- has either been disinterested in getting the legislation that was applied for ⁱⁿ the name of the city through this Session or he was playing local politics for reasons best known to himself. It is an unprecedented case.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs):

Mr. Chairman, really, we should have statements made in this House that can be substantiated some way. There is a legislative committee appointed in your council and all this legislation comes before that committee. Why stand up here and say to the hon. members of the House who are unacquainted with other municipalities the mayor is responsible. The mayor is not on that committee. He may be ex officio, but he appoints a committee on the council to decide these things, and they decided on this and you say the mayor is to blame.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I still insist in what I said, because it is unprecedented. As I was beginning to say, when the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) interrupted, it is strange that a city of Toronto bill should create so much confusion among the hon. Toronto members of this Legislature, as has been the case with this Bill. The Government supporters, who were undoubtedly anxious to put through the Bill, as was requested of them were, themselves, in the dark, and did not know exactly what was involved, nor to what extent they should fight for the principle presented in this bill. The mayor should have, as in the past, called a meeting with the hon. members of this Legislature and explained the contents of the bill, and the reasons why the hon. Toronto members should seek the adoption of such a Bill. This was not done and no attempt was made to explain to the hon. Toronto members the facts justifying Section 3, for instance, which was withdrawn a little while ago by the hon. member whose name is affixed to this Bill. I am sure he was not informed. Another hon. Toronto member, in the absence of the Hon. member for Eglinton .

(Mr. Blackwell), a Government supporter, said that he intended to move for the withdrawal of this section. Obviously he was not certain about it. Certainly this is not the way to handle public matters of legislative character such as is involved in this Bill.

About the item which is still left in the Bill, known as Section 4: This would mean the introduction of an entirely new method of pensions for Commissioners and others in high-salaried brackets. I do not think any hon. member of this House from Toronto or elsewhere would

March 30

E-2

deny Commissioners, an adequate and fair compensation. But we do not know how far that will go. I do not think the citizens of Toronto have been advised of the implications of this section of the Bill any more than they were advised of the factors involved in the attempt to provide for a pension for members of the Toronto Transportation Commission. I do not want it understood that I am opposed to a pension for members of the Toronto Transportation Commission--certainly not the way it was introduced. That applies to Section 4, which seeks to raise the pension to commissioners. I agree, therefore, that this section also should be withdrawn, and if the Hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) in whose name the Bill stands, will not move its withdrawal, I would move it be deleted to give the city of Toronto an opportunity to explain it to the hon. Toronto members, at least, so they will be able to defend it competently and understand it thoroughly, which thorough understanding we do not have at the present time.

MR. DENNISON: Should the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) not really tell us his position on this? I have the feeling in my hear the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is not too happy about this kind of special legislation in the city of Toronto. I have known him for a long time. I know he has to deal with municipalities all over the province, but it would not be so bad if the city of Toronto could come to this House and say that "We are not paying our commissioners too good wages, and therefore, we have to give them a really good pension to keep them on the job." The city of Toronto in the case of department heads pays wages which are extremely good, and, in fact, they are a good deal better

March 30

E-3

than we pay our departments in the civil service, in proportion to the responsibilities they have and in proportion to the amount of work they do. I think that, therefore, we should stay with the principle which is now established and which has been established across the province, that there shall be a maximum, just to prevent favouritism, and just to prevent a council setting up a basis for disagreements and a situation within its pension grants which would cause a lot of hard feeling.

MR. DUNBAR: The city of Ottawa pays two-thirds of the salary the man receives prior to being superannuated. The government of the province of Ontario pays two-thirds to the civil servants of his or her salary received prior to super-annuation. You want to treat Toronto differently entirely. I do not think this is at all unreasonable. So far as the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) saying that they did not bring the hon. members from Toronto in. I do not know. I might have been overlooked in the past. I never was called in to City Council. When I was elected to this House I tried to keep away from City Council. I tried to leave it to the people who had been elected, who were closer to the taxpayers instead of interfering with City Hall. I do not think it is the duty of City Council to bring members of Parliament in, or to bring politics, into their affairs at City Hall, at all. I think the people must have had confidence in them when the people elected them. Here we are with our own civil servants doing the same thing, and you are denying it to the people of the city of Toronto.

March 30

E-4

MR. SALSBERG: I do not think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) should misrepresent the position taken by those who question this bill.

First of all, the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) of course, who is riding rough-shod over municipal governments, whenever he feels like it --

MR. DUNBAR: Just withdraw that.

MR. SALSBERG: The Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is a man who nullifies decisions of all city councils without a moment's hesitation, if, in the Hon. Minister's (Mr. Dunbar) opinion, such nullification is called for.

MR. DUNBAR: Name one. Either put up or shut up.

MR. SALSBERG: The Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) interferes in municipal government affairs, like no one else in this province.

MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has been filling Hansard with hot air for the last six weeks. Name one.

MR. SALSBERG: I could name every municipal government in this province. In fact, the interference of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has reached such proportions that the Association of Mayors have been pleading to be relieved from the yoke the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has put around their necks.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: To gain a bit of freedom, which is now denied them by the Municipal Board which the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) appoints and over which the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) exercises no little influence.

MR. DUNBAR: Do not forget the Welfare Department.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is interfering with the Department of Welfare, too. For the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) to speak about interfering in municipal government, is of course, to suggest something which should cause laughter and which will cause laughter in every City Hall in the province of Ontario. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) who now supports, or seems to support Section 4 of this Bill, is really not in favour of this Section. That is common knowledge to everyone who is acquainted with the Hon. Minister's (Mr. Dunbar) views on this and similar questions.

MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Chairman, I want that withdrawn. That is a deliberate falsehood. There is not any hon. member in this House to whom I have expressed my opinion in regard to this section. I want that withdrawn now.

Do you want me to --

MR. SALSBERG: I do not want the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) at all. The Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is the least desirable of the hon. ministers. Nobody wants the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), neither here nor anywhere else.

MR. DUNBAR: Does the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) want me to call him what I think he is?

MR. SALSBERG: Who has the floor? The Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) should respect the Chair.

I am suggesting that the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is not in favour of that clause. He is the one who always insists, and when he does that --

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has no right to impute. If the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) wants to speak, all well and good.

March 30th, 1951.

E-6

MR. DUNBAR: Withdraw that. I demand a withdrawal.

MR. SALSBERG: Of what?

MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) said I expressed my feeling against this to different hon. members of this House.

MR. SALSBERG: I did not say the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) expressed his feeling against this in this House; I said the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is not in favour of this, and it is known to the hon. members who are acquainted with your feeling about matters of this sort.

MR. DUNBAR: I want you to withdraw that, because the hon. members do not know it.

MR. SALSBERG: Now, Mr. Chairman, it is known --

MR. DUNBAR: Is the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) trying to make this a farce?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has changed his views more than once on bills brought into this House.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) should withdraw that.

MR. SALSBERG: Withdraw what, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: The imputation.

MR. SALSBERG: If the Chairman cannot repeat it, how does he expect me to withdraw something he is not able to define? I did not say -- what?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) imputed that it was known the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) was opposed to this.

MR. MacLEOD: It seems to me that the Chairman is being very unfair.

MR. DUNBAR: Was the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) over here trying to listen to pick up something? The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) comes over to this side with his ears sticking out, listening.

MR. MacLEOD: The Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is making a perfect fool of himself before the people of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: it is suggested here that the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)--

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod)?

MR. MacLEOD: The Hon. Chairman is ruling that the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) should withdraw something, yet you do not tell him what it is he is to withdraw. What is it the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has said that the Chairman wants him to withdraw.

MR. FROST: I think it is plain. The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) takes objection to the fact that it is stated by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has gone around to the hon. members of the House expressing an opinion. The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has said that is not so.

I think the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) might let us get on with the business if he were to say that no such inference as that was intended and withdraw it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I heard what the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) said. Perhaps the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) did not hear what the hon.

member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) said, because they are not the same things, at all.

MR. DUNBAR: Tell us what the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) said.

MR. SALSBERG: I want to say to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that I did not say the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) was going around telling hon. members of this House his opinion, and therefore there is no need of withdrawing something I have not said. All I said was that the hon. members who are acquainted with the Hon. Minister's (Mr. Dunbar) feelings about such matters know that he is not in favour of Section 4.

MR. FROST: No, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN, the Hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) did express here in the House quite forcefully his views in connection with Section 3, I think it was, of the Act, with respect to the Section the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) has withdrawn. There is no reference to this.

May I just interrupt the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) to try and get this matter on the trolley a little bit?

Here is what the Municipal Act in Chapter 243, Section 257, says:

"A council may grant an annual retirement allowance payable weekly, monthly or otherwise, during his life to an employee who has been in the service of the corporation for at least twenty years, and who, while in the service, has become incapable through illness or old age of efficiently discharging his duties."

March 2 th

F-1

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister):

"And provided that the retirement allowance and amount of any pension payments payable to the employee in any year shall not exceed $\frac{3}{5}$ of his total salary for the preceding three years of his salary, or \$2500."

All this Section does, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is to take out the amount of those \$2500 and say that an employee of 20 years service who has become incapable, through illness or old age, shall not get a retirement allowance of more than $\frac{3}{5}$ of his salary of the last three years. There is not much in this to become excited about. After all, the city of Toronto is administered by a big corporation looking after about 700,000; I think we would be quite safe in taking off ^{the} \$2500 limitation. Remember that, with the other safeguard of $\frac{3}{5}$, his salary over the last three years remains the basis. That seems to me to be reasonable. Perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) might look over the situation in Ontario. It may be that perhaps in connection with the general statute some change might be made. But certainly, with the city of Toronto, the size of the corporation, and the service that have to be paid, I do not think the request is unreasonable; and, the Council having made it, I suggest that we grant it.

Remember that, by giving assistance to these people, we are ^{assisting} employees who have worked for the city for at least 20 years. The general Statute provides that this allowance shall be made to a servant who has been

For the purpose of the investigation

the following facts have been ascertained

and it is the duty of the investigator

to the extent of his knowledge

to report the same to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

to the proper authorities

and to the extent of his knowledge

30th March 1951

F-2

employed for at least 20 years and who through illness or old age has become incapacitated.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is not in this Bill.

MR. FROST: No. But the Section, - that is the general Section - says, - and I paraphrase it - that an employee who has been employed for 20 years and is incapacitated through illness or old age from discharging his duties may be awarded a pension not to exceed 3/5 of his salary in the last three years of his work, but not to exceed \$2500. Now, this Section provides the limitation of \$2500 prescribed in sub-section 1 of Section 257 of the Municipal Act, which authorizes a Council to grant annual retirement allowances, shall not apply to the granting of such allowances to officers of the city of Toronto. It does seem to me that to take the \$2500 out is fair. We have recognized that principle in the Civil Service of Ontario. Some years ago there was a limitation of \$2000; later the amount was increased to \$3000; subsequently we took it off entirely. It seems to me entirely reasonable that in a big city like Toronto this limitation of \$2500 does not apply, but the provision relating to 3/5 of the salary which is now in the Act, should remain. As I have said, I am so much impressed with the fairness of this proposal that I think the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) might look over that provision in relation to the rest of Ontario. Certainly it is a fair provision to be applied and I think we should let it go through. The city Council has asked for it, it has been through the Private Bills Committee, and I think there is much fairness in it.

F-3

MR. SALSBERG: For the record, I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not opposed to the removal of the maximum of \$2500 which is now in force.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then may I interrupt?

MR. SALSBERG: Just a moment; but I think there is ground for asking, as some hon. other members and as some people outside this House have asked, should there

be a limit? It is one thing to remove \$2500, but should there be a limit of, say, \$8,000, or \$9,000? What should there be as a limit to a pension? I am not at this moment even suggesting a limit. The matter has not been discussed sufficiently. I agree that the present limitation should be lifted, but nevertheless there will be a limitation that the pension will not be higher than the salary received by members of the government, -- by the Premier --?

MR. FROST: Oh!

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know. But certainly no amount is fixed.

MR. FROST: I see my hon. friend's (Mr. Salsberg) point.

MR. SALSBERG: A Cabinet Minister gets \$8,000 a year. Would a pension be as much as that, or even more than that?

MR. FROST: I think that we can leave that question with the elected representatives of the city of Toronto. They are a pretty wise lot, elected by the people. I do not want to throw away the people's money; and I believe it is fair to allow the grant to be computed on the basis of the 3/5 of the amount of the salary. There are not

March 30th

F-4

"bound to give the maximum; they can give much less if they want to. That is the feeling. I think that is all we need to consider.

MR. SALSBERG: There is a great deal about the proposal that I think is reasonable; but on a point of information, has any other municipality obtained a concession of this kind -- Ottawa, for instance -- on a Private Bill?

Hon. GEORGES H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): No, but the city of Ottawa has this 3/5 provision in their superannuation scheme. I refer to the Section which the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) quoted.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): This is the first one of its kind.

MR. SALSBERG: Then, if this is the first of its kind, Toronto is "in a special position". I wonder if the Minister considered whether it is wise to have one law for Toronto and another for the other municipalities, with respect to a matter of this kind. Perhaps it is. Has that been considered?

Hon. MR. DUNBAR: Yes. I think that in several respects Toronto has to be considered differently from other municipalities. It is a large municipality with a budget of some \$60 odd million dollars. It must have well qualified men and be in a position to encourage those who have been in its employ for a number of years to remain, so that the administration will be more beneficial and helpful to the community. I think that when a city grows to a population of 700,000 it has to be treated differently from a small town or small city or village. You have got to give it more special legislation; there

F-5

is no doubt about that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Ottawa is a pretty big city too.

Hon. MR. DUNBAR: Well, in area, with the annexation, it is now pretty big. You should come down and stay there. It is a lovely city.

MR. FROST: I may say that proposals such as this in regard to the city of Toronto are really a prelude to general legislation. I think myself that the \$2500 appeared to be all right in 1946, when it was started, but that it has become outdated.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We all know that.

MR. SALSBERG: I agree with that.

MR. FROST: When, on Private Bills, consideration is given to municipalities, the legislation becomes general. I have no doubt this is likely to be the case in connection with this Bill.

Section agreed to.

Section 5 agreed to.

Bill reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 21.

REGULATIONS OF LEASEHOLDS BILL

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-first Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 133, "An Act to provide for the Regulations of Leaseholds", Mr. Porter.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I want to put a question to the Prime Minister in connection with this Bill. Is it essential that this Bill should go through this Committee stage today?

MR. FROST: If my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) would

F-6

prefer to let it stand over, it can stand.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I had not in mind any particular discussion. There is one problem which I think, to save time, I would prefer to take up with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

MR. FROST: All right.

Bill 133 stands.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 23.

THE REGISTRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-Third Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 142, "An Act to amend The Registry Act", Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 142 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 24.

THE ALCOHOLISM RESEARCH FOUNDATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 143, "An Act to amend The Alcoholism Research Foundation Act", Mr. Phillips.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill 143 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 25.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fifth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 144, "An Act to amend The Public Health

March 30th

F-7

Act", Mr. Phillips.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill 144 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 26.

THE BEDS OF NAVIGABLE WATERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-sixth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 145, "An Act to amend The Beds of Navigable Waters Act", Mr. Scott.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill 145 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 27.

THE LAND TRANSFER TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-seventh Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 147, "An Act to amend The Land Transfer Tax Act"; Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill 147 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 28.

THE SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-eighth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 148, "An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act", Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Bill 148 reported.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

March 30th

G-1

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 29.

THE PROVINCIAL LOANS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-ninth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 149, "An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act", Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 4:

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): May I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), although it may have nothing to do with this particular Bill, when the Treasurer calls in a loan for redemption before it is due, what measures are taken by the Department to advise the holders of these debentures that the loan is being called.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I think the debentures themselves contain a provision for redeeming them before the due date. Usually it is done by advertising in certain papers in named municipalities in Ontario, and I suppose in the Ontario Gazette. The same procedure, as the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) knows is followed in connection with the redemption of Dominion issues.

Not long ago there was one of the Federal issues called, and it was done by advertisement. I think what the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) probably has in mind is there are cases where people do not learn about these things --

MR. NIXON: You are right, I know that very well.

MR. FROST: You probably had one of those bonds tucked away somewhere, and when you went to cash the coupons, you found out it was no good.

G-2

MR. NIXON: That is right.

MR. FROST: I have run across that problem myself. It is a difficult problem, of course. The hon. members of this House know that there are in the Toronto papers every day legal notices. Personally I have no recollection of ever having read a legal notice, but they are there, and they are notices to the people.

I know we inform the banks and others who are "up" on these things, and they can of course, notify their customers and their branches. The Trust Companies do the same. The result is that the matter I think is fairly well taken care of.

I know there is difficulty there, and it is pretty hard to overcome human nature. It is not necessary to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon), that.

MR. NIXON: In connection with the Dominion calling their loans, it is advertised, even on the radio in the mornings, and I presume they had the callable feature in them, the same as you have in the provincial issues. The Dominion paid \$101 for them. In your own office, there was a card advertising the Dominion loan which was being called at \$101. but when your own debentures are called, I do not see any card in the office here, nor did I see one in the local office in Brantford. As far as the banks are concerned, they paid the coupons, and it was only after they sent the coupons to your office, that they found out the debenture had been called, so how could the holder of the bond know anything about it?

MR. FROST: I think the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) has raised a good point. I will have that matter looked into,

and try and see hereafter that when a debenture is called, those interested will receive proper notice.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question on sub-section 2 of Section 1 of the Bill, which seeks to make it easier for the government to borrow money in the United States. I was wondering why you should ease the possibility of borrowing money in the States -- why it was necessary?

Generally speaking, I would say we should try to reduce to the very minimum all borrowings in the United States. This country has a lot of money, and, whether I like it or not, there are a number of people who have made a lot of money, and who are anxious to invest in Canadian securities, and there seems to be no reason why we should go outside to borrow money which this government may require, and then be obliged to send the interest across the border. What was the main thought behind it? This Section obviously seeks to make it easier to borrow money in the United States. I would much prefer legislation which would make it more difficult to borrow American money, and limit the borrowings as far as possible to the Canadian market.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) raises an issue on that point. It must not be forgotten that we have at the present time something on the order of \$250,000,000 in Ontario and Hydro accounts payable in New York in American funds. The way that occurred is quite familiar to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), and others hon. members who may have been in this House for some time.

Prior to the First World War there was no market in Canada in which to float provincial issues, and most of them

G-4

were floated in England. Subsequently, in the days proximate to the beginning of the last World War -- and even before and following that time -- up to about the time of the depression, borrowings were made very largely in the United States, and that was the time when the three-way bonds came into being, that is, payable in Sterling, United States funds, or Canadian funds. With the depression and the drop of exchange rates, and the exchange difficulties we have experienced in the last 20 years, every effort has been made to domicile our loans -- if I may put it that way -- here. In the last seven or eight years we have borrowed no new money in New York, nor, indeed, outside of Canada. Our borrowings have been altogether in Canada, but nevertheless, we have had ^{to} refund loans in New York, and I may say we are faced with loans to replace American loans, because it is not possible to repatriate the loans, because of the exchange and other difficulties, and we borrow on the American market.

I would not want to do or say anything, by any means, which would affect the possibility or desirability of again borrowing on the American market. Conditions which have existed over the past 20 years may not exist again. At the present time, we are faced with borrowing, in the next 10 years, one billion dollars. That is one thousand million dollars, which is a lot of money. The money market is the same as the butter market or the steel market; when you get shortages, up goes the interest rates, and with the tremendous borrowings which have to be made in the expansion of this country, we may be faced with a situation

G-5

which will drive up the interest rates in this country to a very great extent. We have borrowed in the last few years at about 3%, which is slightly more than the Dominion rate, but less than any other provincial rate. We have been running about second in Canada.

We have had variations in the last 3 or 4 years. My recollection is that about a year ago, in rather a scary market, we borrowed a considerable sum, I think it was around \$40,000,00, or \$50,000,000, and the interest amounted to about 3.18%. Then my recollection is it went down to about to \$3.03%. The money market is rather cautious. At one time, the interest on the Hydro borrowings was about 3.09%. In March, 1951, the picture is changed altogether, and the rates appear to be somewhere around 3.4% up to about 3.5%. We have to face that situation. With the great demand for money in this country, it may be that interest rates will go up. I think that is inevitable.

I think it is a great thing to keep our position in New York clear, for this reason; while we may have to borrow at around 3 1/4 or 3 1-2%, depending on the term of the loan, we may be able to go to New York and borrow at about 2 1/2%. Personally I prefer borrowing in our own country if possible, and have the money circulate in this country but the fact that we can go elsewhere, reflects itself on the rates of this country. We have this very real position. The Hydro Electric Power Commission has contracts on the American side and there is an income on American exchange coming through Hydro, which enables them to negotiate loans in the United States, at very much more favorable rates, so I would caution you against exchange

30th March

G-6

difficulties, because the income from American funds will come in from over there.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is about the situation. The purpose of this Act, of course, is to clarify some things in our Act, regarding borrowing.

, In the United States, it is necessary to comply with the requirements of the Securities Exchange Commission there, and they are very technical, and their requirements are most exacting.

There were these features here in our Loan Act that seemed to be desirable to clear up. My recollection is that last summer we had a refunding loan in New York, and, of course, with owing \$250,000,000 over there, we are bound to have loans from time to time. I certainly, Mr. Chairman, am not subtracting from this, that it may, with the great development on the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers,

be desirable to avail ourselves of borrowing facilities on the other side because of the enormous amount of money required in this country for those needs.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, I am very thankful to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for the very full explanation, and I agree there are occasions when, for refunding purposes, it may be more profitable and wiser to float a new loan, rather than have an old loan at a lower interest rate, than ^{to} attempt to "put it over" in Canadian funds. In those circumstances certainly that is well and proper, but, really, this is a national problem that is arising before the people of Canada, and I suggest that a government such as this should set an example in halting the trend which I think is

very detrimental to the people of this country. The trend is for greater and greater American financial control of the life of this country. To-day there are almost six billion dollars of American funds invested in industry and in loans. This results in fabulous amounts of dividend payments that are payable across the line every year, . . . affecting the economic well-being of the people of this country.

Now, . . . in conclusion, I do not want to get into a discussion on this subject upon which perhaps the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) could cut rings around me, but some of the corporations on Wall Street have played an unfair game with us from time to time. In the city of Toronto we had an experience where a rather big loan was made by them years ago, payable in Sterling, United States and Canadian dollars, ^{and it} ~~was~~ utilized by them to collect sterling dividends when sterling was high, and when it became more profitable, they insisted we pay them in United States dollars and not in sterling. There was a dispute for many years.

MR. FROST: That is in the contract.

MR. SALSBERG: But you cannot change it back and forth in a day. That is what we argued in Toronto. If they choose sterling, we pay in sterling but they chose to get the most beneficial arrangement, and . . . the city of Toronto ^{was faced} ~~with~~ a series of demands. What I want to conclude with is this, that aside from the section before us, it would be good policy and an excellent example for the province, when it needs this

H-3

money, that it seeks to sell its bonds to the people of the province and small organizations in this province who would invest if an approach was made to them by the government to solicit their investments in small amounts, one hundred dollar and five hundred dollar bonds. There are many associations in this city who seek opportunities for investment, in addition to insurance companies and the province of Ontario, I am sure, would have no difficulty in determining what is a reasonable interest payment for a certain loan and keep that loan within the province for the people of this province and for organizations who would invest in it as a gilt-edged proposition, rather than going to the United States money market, when they could deal with Canadian financiers. I think that would meet the financial requirements of the province, and such bodies as Hydro, and would accrue to the benefit of the people and the organizations the people have built up in the province.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, before we pass over this, on Section 2, the two words in the first line read, "pass the hat". I would ask the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is that government policy or a typographical error?

MR. FROST: I am always glad to have anybody pass the hat for me.

Section 5 agreed to.

Bill No. 149 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.

THE HOSPITALS TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirtieth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 150, "An Act to Amend the Hospitals Tax Act), Mr. Frost.

Section 1 agreed to.

On Section 2.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I asked the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) yesterday a question with respect to taxing places that have no cover charge. I did not get any answer. Besides that, I would like to point out to the Government for their consideration that this has been brought to my attention by a number of people who are interested in this thing, that for some time Canadian talent has been having a rather precarious time of it. However, lately, a number of night spots have been employing a lot of Canadian talent, and it has increased the opportunity for Canadian talent. The feeling among them is, from what I gathered, if this tax goes into effect an indiscriminate tax on the lounges because of the entertainment that is in there, many of these entertainers are going to be out of work. What is going to happen is, with this section, many of these places will put in canned music, background music, and drop professional performers from their staff. That has been brought to my attention by people who are quite interested in it.

MR. FROST: I do not want to overlook the hon. member's (Mr. Walters) question. I am sorry this bill was called up when the hon. member for High Park

H-5

(Mr. Temple) is not in his seat, because he might support me on this matter, but I see the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) has been at a meeting at Ottawa in which he says the government does not do anything but assist the liquor interests and what-not. Now, if he were here to-day, perhaps he would take a different view than that of the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters). I might even look for support from the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) in this matter.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): I am with you.

MR. FROST: Good, I have one vote. Now, Mr. Chairman, the point gets down to this, we have in the province, a hospitals tax. We charge that tax-- which was first of all twenty per cent, then reduced to fifteen per cent, and is now being reduced to twelve and one half per cent,--on amusements, such as a hockey match, ^{and} we have extended that to include football games, motion picture theatres, and the like. I have here a great list of advertisements ^{which} appear in the papers here. I would like to give them to the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters). It is very difficult to see why a person going to the Imperial Theatre or Loew's Theatre should pay a tax of twelve and one half per cent and yet someone else putting on a floor show in these places should be exempt from tax. It does not seem to be fair.

I will not go over the various advertisements, but certainly

the information is given that you go to these places and see a show. I do not see any reason why they should not pay a tax. We have to include this tax on the food and drinks there, but we do it on this basis, we make the limit of the tax one dollar. In other words, if four persons went and it cost them thirty-two dollars for their entertainment and food and drinks, if four people spent thirty-two dollars, the tax in that case would be a maximum of four dollars. If they spend anything over that amount, the tax would not be payable. Now, under that amount it would be greater, there is not any other way you can work it out. If for instance, ^{you} establish a cover charge of one or two dollars in these places, it is not really a fair arrangement. We feel this is the fairest arrangement, and we are not changing the basis of this tax at all. All we are doing is to redefine "entertainment."

Now, I see some of these advertisements here, I see, for instance, here is one place, "Ivory Joe and his Seven Men of Jazz". I do not want to get impaled on any of these discrimination acts we are passing here. But if Joe just plays music, there is no tax payable, but if Ivory Joe ~~sings~~ sings, there is tax payable. We have to draw the line somewhere. That is also true of the University Four, whoever they may be, if the University Four play musical instruments or play the piano, then there is no tax, but once they get into the realm of "wisecracks" ^{and} jokes, then they have to pay the tax. That is where it comes in.

This Act provides that for background music only, they can have an orchestra as large as they like and no tax, but if they sing, there is a tax.

I know the hon. member (Mr. Walters) might say that is unfair, but you have to draw a line somewhere, and I think it is a fair, reasonable line to draw, and our experience in this line really came from some of those people themselves. Remember, in this business there is a great deal of competition. One man runs a very fine place where you can get meals and service and music. The next fellow down the street gets in someone who performs, some floor show or something of the sort, and it makes it more difficult for the other good man to compete. That situation was met in the United States and the federal provision for tax of this sort is on the basis of background music. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is a fair thing. I do not think it is in any way oppressive, I think it is a fair provision for people competing in amusement places that are definitely liable for tax, such as motion pictures and others. After all, they are entertainment places and they pay the tax. It seems to me that the eating places cross the line and entertainment places certainly do, and then they will pay the tax if they go past a certain limit.

MR. WALTERS: I might point out to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that when he accepts musical instruments and says only pay a tax on the human voice,

the human voice is, after all, the most beautiful of musical instruments.

MR. FROST: I agree with that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Sometimes.

Section 1 agreed to.

On Section 2.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, on Section 2, I would like to suggest to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he considers raising this taxable amount. At the present time this tax reaches right down to the fifteen-cent admissions, and through the fifteen-cent admissions, to the twenty-cent admissions; it takes two cents off the people who are admitted. Now, it seems to me that in view of the fact that this is not really a hospital tax, it goes into the federal revenue, in view of the fact that the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) recognizes that it is not just a tax, he could somewhat change this amusement tax which falls most heavily on the younger people, on the persons who are least able to pay. It falls least heavily upon the older person, the person who has made a substantial amount of money, who can sit back and who is not so interested in entertainment, a person who can entertain himself, so to speak. I think it would be a very fair request to raise this and start the tax at the forty-cent level and have the tax withdrawn entirely on amusement under forty cents. I am sure the young people, boys and girls, and those who have to watch their pennies in choosing an entertainment and who are forced to choose in the

lower-priced branches of entertainment,

would appreciate it if the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would strike out everything under forty cents. You may have to make it thirty-eight cents, or thirty-seven cents, there may be a point there where you can force a reduction in the price of the show, but I would say on general principle I would oppose anything under forty cents. I am sure the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has given some thought to that. What about being a little generous to-day and striking off the other half of this section?

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 150 reported.

(Take I follows.)

March 30th, 1951.

I-1

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order
No. 31.

RAISING OF MONEY ON THE CREDIT OF THE
CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 31st Order; House in
Committee on Bill No. 151, "An Act to authorize the
Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated
Revenue Fund." Mr. Frost.

On Section 1.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman,
just to follow up a point I have raised with respect to
previous bills, what facilities exist to-day for notifying
such organizations as Fraternal societies, credit unions,
co-ops, and so on, of the availability of Provincial
Government bonds for their investment -- or are there
no such facilities at all? The point I am trying to
make, again, is that we should go out of our way to offer
to such popular peoples' organizations the opportunity
of investing their money in Government bonds such as
those offered by this province before we hand the bonds
over to a group of investment brokers and promoters on
Bay Street, St. James Street, or Wall Street.

My question is, what facilities, if any, exist
to-day in the Treasury of this Province to notify
organizations of the character I mentioned, as well as
individuals, of the availability of bonds they could pur-
chase very safely.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.
Chairman, our business of course, in borrowing is done

through our various banks, agents and agencies. We have not, of course, any sales organizations of our own. That has never been the case. The only time I recollect any effort of selling directly ourselves, was one time a proposal was made many years ago of selling bonds through the Provincial Savings Offices.

MR. JOLLIFFE: 1935.

MR. FROST: Yes, around 1935, through the "Provincial Savings Offices."

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it was May or June, 1935.

MR. FROST: I am not sure of the date; but that was never put into effect. . The then government, made certain arrangements which are very largely perpetuated by this Government, , setting up an organization through the various banks, through the various bond houses and others having their own sales organizations. They have their own clients. For instance, they will have on a list of clients, various co-operatives and what not. When an issue comes up, of course, they contact their people and they endeavour to place these bonds far and wide among their own clients. I think that is the best arrangement.

We have no sales organization of our own, and it is certainly very difficult, of course, to maintain a provincial sales organization.

The Federal Government does not maintain a sales organization, although they have a closer relationship with the banks than we have because of their powers over banking and that sort of thing.

I think our bonds are very widely distributed.

There is every indication that our bonds are very widely held by a lot of small investors. We had an example to-day of at least one holder of bonds who had not been informed that the issue had been redeemed, which gives some tangible proof of the fact that the bonds are quite widely held.

MR. SALSBERG: That bondholder was close enough to the Government to know that bonds were available at that time, I am sure. He is not an outsider, I presume.

I want to suggest to the Hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that we should establish an organization to reach out to the bodies which I mentioned. I do not see anything wrong during a campaign whenever we have to float a big loan to reach societies, unions, co-ops, individuals, and even small municipal governments which may have funds in their sinking fund which they would gladly invest in Government bonds.

I do not know whether this is the time to find out what happened in 1935, but, if my memory serves me, there was a battle on at the time between the then government, the big banks, the bondholders, and the Prime Minister was threatening them that he would raise funds without them, going directly to the people. I do not know why he did not follow it through. Certainly, we should make it possible for citizens of this province and for organizations of people in this province to share in the purchase of bonds. It very often happens that the big bondholders will put an advertisement in the

paper announcing a big loan, and then say that, "This is just put in for the record, but all the bonds are taken up." They are usually taken up by big investment companies, large insurance companies, and so on, but the people down below do not get the opportunity to buy those bonds.

I suggest the Hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) give this matter some thought. I am sure it is worth considering. I am also certain such an innovation would meet with universal approval of the people of this province.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 151 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report certain bills, with and without amendments.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report ten bills without amendments, one bill with amendments, moves the adoption of the report and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn, might we revert to third readings, starting with the Second Order? We might as well clean those up.

THE ESCHEATS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order; Third reading,

Bill No. 135, An Act to Amend the Escheats Act. Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 135.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.3.

THE LAW SOCIETY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading, Bill No.136, An Act to Amend the Law Society Act. Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, third reading of Bill No.136.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading, Bill No. 137, An Act to Amend the Mining Act; Mr. Gemmell.

HON. DANA PORTER (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Gemmell, I move third reading of Bill No. 137.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.5.

THE COMMUNITY CENTRES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, Third Reading, Bill No. 138, An Act to Amend the Community Centres Act. Mr. Kennedy.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I move third reading of Bill No. 138.

Motion agreed to; Third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.6.

REGISTRATION OF NURSES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth order; third reading, Bill No. 139, An Act respecting the registration of nurses. Mr. Phillips.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Phillips, I move third reading of Bill No. 139.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.7.

NURSING

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order; third reading, Bill No. 140, An Act respecting Nursing. Mr. Phillips.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr.

I-7

Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Phillips, I move third reading of Bill No. 140.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House until Monday, we have a very few orders left on the Order Paper. On Monday, I am not just sure in what order we will proceed, but it is quite obvious that the business will be as follows. There is the second reading of Order No. 9, standing in the name of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) which might be considered; Order No. 21 with respect to regulations of leaseholds; Order No. 22 with respect to Niagara Parks Act, and Order No. 32 with respect to the Farm Products Marketing Act. Those are on the order paper at the moment.

There are the Bills introduced today, which I think are largely routine and which I am hopeful will be in shape on Monday to be considered on second reading. Then we have The Election Act which I think will be reported, making two Acts to be reported on Monday. It may be too early to consider the second readings on Monday, but in any event the reports will be here, as I understand it.

We also have a large item, the Budget Debate, and I would like those who are participating in that debate to be ready to go ahead on Monday. I would like to take the Estimates of the Department of Lands

and Forests on Monday night.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.27 of the clock,
p.m.

